LIBRARY
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 113, NO. 14 NEW YORK, MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1945 NUMBER 1609

Policy for Japan

As a policy declaration, the statement of the American government on the treatment of Japan is reassuring on several grounds. This government is acting on behalf of all the Allies, and participation in the occupation by the others will be welcomed, though the Supreme Commander is American. "The policy is to use the existing form of government in Japan, not to support it." We are to encourage democratic tendencies. If forcible means are adopted by the Japanese people, we shall not oppose them. The occupation forces can act directly in pursuit of our objectives if the Emperor or other members of the government prove refractory.

In addition to arresting war leaders and criminals, disarming the nation, dissolving militaristic or nationalistic organizations and forbidding war industry, we shall give positive encouragement to the development of democratic organizations in labor, industry and agriculture, and favor "wide distribution of income and of the ownership of the means of production and trade." The large banking and industrial combinations owned by the Zaibatsu are to be dissolved, and no one can have economic power who does not use it for pacific purposes.

The rest of the formula—such as permission to keep such industry and trade as may be necessary for the sustenance of the people—was already well known. Reparations are to be largely on the German model. These policies are clear; much depends on the detailed interpretations given them and the skill with which they are administered. This is the challenge for MacArthur.

MacArthur in Trouble

Though General MacArthur has denied that he has political ambitions, his partisan supporters in this country will, if they are not careful, make it impossible to retain him in command of the occupation forces in Japan. Either he is the agent of national—and international—policy, or he is guiding his acts by preparations to run for office. We cannot allow him to do both at once. If Undersecretary of State Acheson is to be rebuked by the Senate for saying that our foreign policy is determined by the civilian government, the Senate will allow the inference that we are in danger of military dictatorship. Mr. Acheson was simply reporting the basic premise of American democracy. Doubts concerning MacArthur's pronouncements seemed to make this reassurance timely. If reactionary Republicans choose to interpret it as a rebuke, they thereby admit that it may have been deserved.

We say this not because, as supporters of progressivism in the United States, we wish to prevent General MacArthur from being the Republican candidate in 1948. Unless popular opinion concerning him has been greatly misunderstood, he would not be a formidable contender. When his military duties are ended, he has a right to be considered on his merits as a possible President. But not before.

Resurgent Isolationists

John Chamberlain in *Life* has now entered the campaign inaugurated by John T. Flynn in the Chicago *Tribune* to prove that President Roosevelt expected the attack on Pearl Harbor and welcomed it as a means of getting the United States into war. This whole ar-

CONTENTS

The Week 419
Editorials
Conflict in London 423
Arguments against Britain 424
General Articles
Detroit's Got 'Em Again . . Edwin A. Lahey 426
Politics and Europe's Hunger . Helen Fuller 428
British Labor's Foreign Policy . K. Zilliacus 430
Congress Grapples with Science . . . . . Morris Llewellyn Cooke 433
The Alternative in Rumania . Heinz Eulau 436
Reconversion of a Bomber Pilot . Philip Ardery 437
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 438
A Communication . . Otis Durant Duncan 439
The Bandwagon 440
Correspondence 440
Books in Review
Existentialism: A Preface . . . Jean Wahl 442
A Noble Experiment . Robert Gorham Davis 444
American Science—13,000 B.C.? . . . . . Kenneth Macgowan 445
A Reader's List 445

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1945, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gument seems to us a super-quibble. We have seen no evidence that Roosevelt expected the attack to be delivered at that particular spot, but there never has been any doubt that everyone in authority knew the Japanese would reject our policy and were likely to attack somewhere. The United States spent months preparing to resist such an assault, and our armed forces were warned that one was imminent. We assume that neither Mr. Chamberlain nor Mr. Flynn would agree with the military critics who argue that we should have taken the offensive instead of waiting for the Japanese to deliver the first blow.

What Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Flynn are in effect saying is to repeat the old isolationist argument that we should meekly have allowed Japan to pursue her career of conquest in order to avoid war with her. For it was our objection, and our increasing toughness in asserting it, which led Japan to strike when she did. They are welcome to that argument if they want it. Aside from all questions of international morality, such ostrich behavior would scarcely have ensured our peace for very long.

That Wave of Strikes

We are back to normal, if not to normalcy, in regard to labor relations. Once again, strikes have taken place, or are threatened, in all parts of the country; and once again, the conservative press is exhibiting outraged surprise and moral censure, just as though no one had ever gone on strike before and it was an action roughly comparable to burning down an orphan asylum. True, union members are not angels in human form, any more than other people; they are sometimes arbitrary and unreasonable, and so are employers. The points to remember about the present strikes are: 1. That the proportion of strikers to the proportion of non-strikers in the whole country is still extremely small; the press lumps the strikes together and makes them seem greater in extent than the facts justify. 2. Most of these strikes are an attempt, not to get more money, but to keep take-home pay at the current level, in industries which have been cut from 48 hours with overtime to 40 hours at straight time. 3. During the war, wage rates were in general held to increases of only about 15 percent, while the cost of living went up at least 30 and perhaps as much as 40 percent; when workers had larger family incomes, these came mostly from working overtime or from having several members of the family employed. 4. High wages are definitely a part of the formula for national prosperity approved by the government, by all leading groups of employers, by the press and public opinion. 5. It is true that many employers say they cannot meet the present demands without increasing the prices of their products and thus bringing nearer a further degree of inflation. But in the past, employers have many times made these claims, which have afterward turned out to be false, and they do not come into court with very clean hands. They should be compelled to open their books to inspection by the unions and by impartial arbiters, before their statements can be accepted at their face value.

Remove Patton from Germany

The policy of our Military Government in Germany of encouraging reactionary, if not fascist, elements and of discouraging liberal and democratic forces, has been apparent for some time. In spite of protests by American correspondents in Germany and liberal editors here at home, little has been done to change that policy. To a large extent this has been because responsibility could not easily be fixed. Were the War Department, field headquarters or the local commanders to blame? General George Patton Jr., governor of the Eastern Military District of the American zone, in a recent interview admitted his responsibility in this respect. "My opinion," the General was quoted as saying, "is that to create an anarchistic situation by not restoring normal communications and law and order is more dangerous than having some Nazis work for us." The struggle between fascist and anti-fascist forces, the General believes, "is just like a Democratic-Republican election fight." Asked why he had permitted the appointment of reactionaries to public office, he is reported to have answered: "What do you want, a lot of Communists?" It should be obvious to everyone that a man of so limited a sense of democratic responsibility is ill suited to govern in Germany and should be removed as soon as possible.

Palestine and the UNO

President Truman has written a letter to the British Cabinet supporting the request that Palestine be opened immediately, on an emergency basis, for the entry of 100,000 Jews. The British have responded, according to a Reuter dispatch, by saying that the whole issue of the future of Palestine, and particularly the question of Jewish immigration, should be referred to the United Nations Organization, as soon as that body is in existence on a working basis. This seems to us a thoroughly sensible suggestion. The British have long said privately, and have hinted publicly, that their reluctance to encourage Jewish immigration into Palestine, and even to live up to the pledges they made nearly thirty years ago, has been because they did not dare alienate the Arabs, in view of the whole relationship of the British Empire to the Arab dominated countries of the Near East. But a settlement made by the UNO would be one in which all the Arab countries would themselves participate in greater or less degree; it would have behind it the authority of 50 nations, comprising all the great powers except those of the Axis (and even some of these might be included). There is every reason to believe that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNO should be able to work out an answer to this problem. Some months ago, even the conference of the Arab states, which met at Cairo, proposed that Jewish immigration into Palestine be continued until the Jewish and Arab populations were equal, and that they then divide the authority; the proposal was dropped only because of the hostile reception it received in some Jewish quarters.

Unemployment Pay

The Senate has passed an unemployment-compensation bill which is slightly better than the version which came out of committee but falls far short of the original plan proposed by the President. The bill, which now goes to the House, gives all workers eligible for unemployment benefits a guarantee of 26 weeks of payments regardless of state laws, but the $25-per-week-maximum provision has been thrown out completely. More than 700,000 federal and maritime workers are blanketed into the system, and stranded war workers are allowed a maximum of $200 with which to travel home or to a new job.

The hero of the final floor fight to get even this much protection for industrial veterans was Progressive Senator Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin, who rallied lagging votes to make the 26-week-coverage provision mandatory on the states, after Majority Leader Alben Barkley of Kentucky seemed to have lost that fight. It was hard to tell in the days just prior to the final vote whether the Taft Republicans or the President's legislative lieutenants were the principal obstacle to passage. Administration spokesmen on the Hill, by their ineptness, were probably of more service to Taft and Vandenberg than to Truman. The House will fight an adequate program even more vigorously than the Senate did. The President will have to shift his team of legislative assistants if he is to have any chance of success in the House, even at the beginning.

Administration Sitdown

New Dealers on Capitol Hill have thus far only reached the stage of muttering under their breath. Only a few congressmen will admit, even off the record, that there is any lack of fighting spirit in the majority leadership. But last week CIO President Philip Murray spoke out very flatly about the current legislative crisis. "Three of the leading measures called for in the President's message of September 6 are threatened by lack of any organized effort by the Administration or its supporters inside or outside of Congress," Murray charged. "These are the full-employment bill, the unemployment-compensation bill and the 65-cent-minimum-wage bill. If these three measures are not passed in substantially the form asked for by the President, it will represent a body blow to postwar recovery and a repudiation of the President's leadership. And," Murray added significantly, "I do not consider that the Administration and the leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress have shown sufficient exertion to date on these crucial measures." Truman's real test is just beginning. From now on he must be judged by how hard he fights for the New Deal ideas he has embraced.

Half a Loaf for India

The Indian nationalists profess themselves deeply disappointed at the offer made them a few days ago by the Labor government in Great Britain. They have been invited to hold provincial and central elections next February or March, and at these elections, delegates will be selected to prepare a new constitution. While it is being written, the main Indian parties are asked to create an executive council to deal with pressing social and economic problems. Indian leaders point out that these proposals are almost identical with the famous Cripps plan, which they found unacceptable. They want political prisoners to be released at once, and no more arrests to be made. They want guaranteed civil liberties, including a strict British policy of hands off the elections. In London it is suggested that the new scheme is an attempt to give the Labor government a breathing space of a few months while it makes up its mind what to do next. Certainly, the general climate of opinion should be better for the same proposals put forward by a Labor government rather than one dominated by Winston Churchill.

An Injustice to Mr. Davis

William H. Davis, until a few days ago Director of Economic Stabilization, has had what seems to be rather shabby treatment from President Truman. Davis was widely quoted in the conservative daily press, to the accompaniment of angry editorials, as having said that wages ought to be increased 50 percent while prices remained stationary. This would certainly be a legitimate and desirable ambition for the United States, and we see no reason why Mr. Davis was not entitled to express this view; but the conservatives, who want to cut wages instead of increasing them, were furious. They brought pressure to bear on

Drawn by Eric Godal, Copyright by Field Publications, Inc., and reprinted by courtesy of PM.

Start Chopping at the Roots

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Truman, who fired Mr. Davis by abolishing his agency. True, the OES was due to be consolidated; but the way it was done showed that Mr. Davis was being rebuked. In point of fact, however, he had been misquoted. What he said was that an increase in living standards of 40 or 50 percent, set up as a goal by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, was certainly desirable, and that unit costs in production of consumer goods should go down as volume of production increases. After President Truman had fired Mr. Davis, someone evidently told him of the injustice, and the President wrote what virtually amounts to a letter of apology; but he didn't find a new job for him. Davis is one of the best men in Washington, and if he wants to stay, the President should make use of him.

Watch the FCC

We should like to underline the warning given by Helen Fuller in her article in the *New Republic* of September 24 about the Federal Communications Commission. On October 8, the FCC will begin granting licenses for new frequency-modulation radio stations. There are about 400 applications pending, and of these, more than a hundred are from nationalist-isolationist groups who think along Hearst-McCormick-Patterson-Gannett lines. The plan to reserve some channels for war veterans has apparently been abandoned. Several members of the FCC are conservative in their thinking; they are likely to seek to give many, if not all, available channels to individuals and groups who are highly undesirable from the social point of view, who will use their stations either for the sole purpose of making money, or to spread reactionary propaganda. In so far as hearings have been held, they have taken place in Washington, where practically no witnesses are present except the representatives of the applicants. At the very least, the granting of these licenses should be postponed until hearings can be held in the cities where the stations will be built.

Wallace Reorganizes

After months of quiet work, Secretary of Commerce Wallace has brought out a comprehensive plan for reorganization of his department. Mr. Wallace proposes that three new assistant secretaryships be created—for international trade, industrial economy and small business—to supplement the present office of assistant secretary for air commerce. To help "assure full, profitable production and full, gainful employment," he would open field offices in every important industrial area, establish a series of industry advisory committees, and work more closely with national trade and business organizations. Among other important changes would be: a national census every five instead of every ten years, to provide information needed to assure full employment; a strong program to stimulate imports necessary to a two-way economy; expansion of research activities in the Bureau of Standards and elsewhere, especially as an aid to small business; modernization of the patents system; and planned distribution of scientific and technological information to industry.

Both President Truman and the National Association of Manufacturers have given their general approval to Wallace's broad program. It will be up to the Senate Finance and House Interstate Commerce Committees to authorize the specific changes and approve the required budget to carry out the plan.

Coöps in London

The coöperative movement is important but not spectacular, and for that reason it usually gets less attention in the press than its significance would justify. At a meeting in London a few days ago, spokesmen for 75 million members of coöperatives in 39 countries met to report progress and plan for the future. They proposed an international coöperative college and a news service to supply information to the hundreds of journals of the coöperative movement throughout the world. They asked the United Nations Organization to set up an International Coöperative Office, and, carrying out the Atlantic Charter, to give coöperatives equal access to raw materials with other purchasers. Resolutions were introduced demanding currencies stabilized on a basis of their internal purchasing power, and the elimination of trade restrictions and monopolies. As we mentioned last week, a proposal was brought forward for a worldwide coöperative petroleum association. Significantly, representatives of Soviet Russia asked that separate delegations be seated from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The coöperative movement is not, all by itself, any magic key to Utopia; but it has enormous importance, both because of its present power and its even greater potentialities.

The Postage on Books

Several years ago the postal rate charged on books was drastically lowered. The initiative for this action came from President Roosevelt, under strong prompting from Morris Ernst, the well known liberal attorney of New York. Under the new rule, books went at the same rate as the editorial contents of newspapers and magazines, or one and a half cents per pound. (The advertising section of a magazine or newspaper goes at a different and much higher rate, divided into zones based upon the distance that the matter is carried. This seems just and reasonable, since advertising is a purely commercial enterprise and editorial content, at least in theory, is not.) Some time ago, seeking sources of revenue, Congress doubled the rate on books to three cents a pound. Now an attempt is being made to put books, which are exclusively editorial content, under a zone system. Nearly all books are published in or near New York City, and the result of this policy would be to penalize heavily recipients of books in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South and West. No logical defense can be made for this proposal. If Congress passes it, it will be only because the book trade is without powerful friends and therefore subject to persecution. Some newspapers and magazines have displayed singular apathy in this situation, apparently on the absurd ground that books are competitors of theirs! It should be obvious that what the world needs today is more and freer communication, not less and more expensive. The government loss on book postage is only about eight percent of the loss, on the whole probably well justified, on newspapers and magazines. This bill should go into the ash can.

The FAO Goes to Work

It would be hard to overestimate the importance of the conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, which will take place beginning October 16 in Quebec. This is the first formal meeting of the first permanent group under the United Nations Organization. Forty-four governments were represented at the preliminary meeting in the United States in May, 1943; more than twenty of them have now adopted the constitution drafted at that time, and this is sufficient to bring the new body into operation.

The aims of the FAO are as broad as they could very well be. It seeks to raise the level of nutrition for the people of the world, to increase the efficiency of farmers, fishermen and woodsmen everywhere, to bring a better life for these people and at the same time to develop an expanding world economy in every aspect. It is ironic that two-thirds of the more than two billion people in the world never get enough to eat, from the cradle to the grave, and especially ironic when you realize that two-thirds of the people of the world are farmers. Obviously, the world needs more food; yet commercial farmers are haunted just as much by the dread of a surplus as they are by the fear of a crop failure, since a surplus usually means that prices go down below the cost of production.

To these chronic troubles the war has added plenty of its own. In vast areas, especially in Europe, making a crop will be almost impossible for some time to come. Fields are sown with land mines; it is reported that ten men a day are being killed, in France alone, trying to remove these mines. In the Netherlands, thousands of acres of farm land have been covered by the salt sea and cannot be reclaimed for several years. Farm animals have been killed and eaten, or blown to bits by bombs; farm buildings and machinery have been destroyed or carried off; seeds, fertilizer, equipment—all are lacking. There is a desperate shortage of farm labor. With all these problems the FAO will grapple at its first meeting at Quebec. Its budget is only $2.5 million while it is getting started, and thereafter $5 million a year. If it were to have funds relative to the size of its job, $5 billion would seem to be more appropriate.

Conflict in London

THE HIGH HOPES that preceded the first meeting of the foreign ministers of the Big Five in London have now given way to a wave of pessimism and disillusionment. Not only has little progress been made in the direction of a workable peace, but the proceedings are held in a spirit that apparently envisages another war rather than peace as the greater possibility for the future. In no other way is it possible to explain the wrangling over strategic areas, colonial possessions and spheres of political influence. The world, it seems, has again become a big grab-bag, and the great powers are behaving worse than children at a party. It is obvious that as long as the great powers cannot agree among themselves on the vital issues of their own military and economic security, they cannot be expected to settle the problems of the world. Perhaps the best thing that can come out of the London conference is that none of the questions under consideration be settled with finality. For in world politics there is nothing worse than a bad compromise.

What are the reasons for this deplorable state of affairs? First, it seems obvious that the old fears and suspicions are still as strong as they have ever been. And responsibility for this lies predominantly with Russia and the United States. To a large extent, the Russians have themselves to blame for the distrust with which they are viewed by the Western powers. Their lack of political liberty at home—making impossible public criticism of state policies—their failure to relax censorship and their unilateral actions in occupied countries all contribute to accentuate existing uneasiness. Their unpredictable diplomatic behavior, moreover, makes rational negotiations extremely difficult. The Russians have many good reasons for some of their demands, but why, for instance, did they suddenly insist on being individual trustees of Libya or Eritrea? Their diplomatic maneuvers resemble the operations of a stock-market speculator more than those of an economic planner.

The part played by the United States in precipitating the present crisis is equally clear. While we are trying to settle the affairs of Europe, insisting on democratic governments in Southeastern Europe, we are reluctant to share with Russia the secret of the atomic bomb because sole ownership of the secret is said to be indispensable to our military security. Or we suddenly cancel Lend-Lease, giving the impression that we want to strangle Great Britain economically. Obviously, if we let Russia in on the atomic-bomb secret, which she will discover sooner or later anyway, we would contribute immeasurably to a change in the present atmosphere of distrust, and our demands for democracy would carry real moral weight. Similarly,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an understanding with Britain which would counteract the bad impression created by the cancellation of Lend-Lease would also enable the new British Labor government to embark on the constructive foreign policy that it is expected to carry through.

But more is involved in establishing a workable peace than harmony among those on whom responsibility for its maintenance ultimately depends. The alternative facing the world is not simply a choice between the prospect of international anarchy and the utopian dream of world government now. What is needed is an engineering approach to the problems of peace. The war has taught us that, granted a common aim, the great powers—regardless of their political ideologies and economic systems—can coöperate practically and fruitfully. Combined commissions of experts, dealing with concrete problems of international concern, such as the allocation of war materials or foodstuffs, did excellent and mutually satisfactory work. International agencies, such as UNRRA or the Food and Agriculture Organization, were set up on a functional basis. International agreements, such as the Convention on Civil Aviation or the Bretton Woods plan on the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, pave the way for closer coöperation and mutual confidence.

This functional, pragmatic approach, we believe, is the most effective method of settling problems which require genuinely international solutions. The questions of the disposal of strategic areas, colonial possessions and boundaries, which have the London conference moving in circles, should be approached in a similar manner. Trusteeships, for instance, implying international administration of strategic areas and larger territories, are a practical answer to a problem which can never be successfully solved by diplomatic compromise. Boundaries, again, should be established not on a basis of conflicting claims, but on the basis of investigation by experts on the spot. The same procedure can be applied to the problem of the kind of government a country should have. It is certainly silly to demand democratic governments in countries where the conditions of democracy either do not exist or where political democracy is really not the issue. Commissions made up of experts, representing both interested parties as well as neutrals, and chosen for their technical knowledge, should be set up to decide these issues on a scientific rather than a political basis. These commissions, moreover, would represent a real step forward in the direction of world government.

Of all the proposals made in London only the United States draft of a treaty with Italy approaches the kind of solution that is practical from this point of view. The waiving of reparations is sound economic policy, not only because Italy is in no position to pay, but also because reparations are of doubtful economic value to their receivers. The proposal to make Trieste a free port and to adjust the Yugoslav-Italian frontier is equally sound. The administration of Libya and Eritrea by an administrator appointed by the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Organization and assisted by an international committee of seven members, with the promise of independence in ten years, also makes sense. Finally, the proposal for the demilitarization of a strategic island like Pantelleria, which the British might claim, is judicious.

If these suggestions are made in good faith, they should also be applied to other areas. There is no reason why Hong Kong, for instance, should not be a free port, or why islands like Okinawa or Saipan should not be demilitarized and administered by an international commission. But if the British insist on retaining Hong Kong, or if we demand the annexation of the Pacific islands, Russia would certainly be justified in requesting, let us say, exclusive control of the Straits. And the struggle for power would continue to dominate international politics.

Arguments Against Britain

THE OBJECTIONS to giving necessary financial aid to Britain during the transitional crisis occasioned by the end of Lend-Lease are disreputable on moral grounds, which it is not our purpose to emphasize. In addition, they are fatuous on grounds of American self-interest, as interpreted by the coldest economic and political standards.

Take, for instance, the argument that this country should not subsidize the new Labor government in its plan to socialize industry—a scheme which, it is frequently asserted, will involve the incurring of heavy deficits in the industries in question. Why, it is asked, should we permit these deficits to be paid by American dollars? Americans sympathetic with the aims of British Labor will instantly reject this argument on broad grounds. Even conservatives ought to welcome the trial of a mixed system of public and private ownership, which, if it succeeds, will indicate a way out of our economic troubles that does not involve communism, dictatorship or the complete abolition of free enterprise, and if it fails, will confirm their prejudices. If they allow it to be said that the experiment failed because of their sabotage, or succeeded in spite of it, they will ultimately be in much greater peril.

Aside from such larger considerations, the argument is complete economic nonsense. However much money the British government may need in order to purchase the industries in question or to subsidize them thereafter, the money will be British and will be entirely provided at home. Not a single dollar would help in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the process, since the owners who would have to be reimbursed would receive British securities and the workers who would have to be paid would receive pounds, shillings and pence. Yet it is dollars which we are asked to supply, not sterling. The necessity for dollars arises from the necessity to import, which would exist under the most conservative British regime as fully as under the most radical. It may also be pointed out—though this question is entirely irrelevant to the argument—that the desirability of nationalization arises from the need to make the nationalized industries more, not less, efficient, and that it is improbable that they will be operated at a loss.

Of course, by forcing Britain to cut her imports drastically we could make life harder for the British people, and the effect might be to make the government unpopular. This would be as true of a Conservative as of a Labor government. When the people learned, however—as they would be sure to learn—that their hardships resulted from foreign pressure designed to make them abandon their principles, Britons could be counted upon to redouble their loyalty to their chosen regime and to see their task through.

A more moderate type of argument is directed against the British reluctance to accept interest-bearing loans as a substitute for the vanished Lend-Lease, on the same low terms which have been accepted by France, and probably will be accepted by Russia and others. Why, it is asked, should Britain be so squeamish? What is different about her position? The difference is obvious on a moment's consideration. Britain is far more dependent on imports than any of the other nations in question, and will have far greater difficulty in balancing her international payments. Russia is, normally, almost self-contained, and even France has far greater natural resources than the United Kingdom. Both can be fairly certain of ability to repay principal and interest; Britain cannot. No nation can safely enlarge a foreign debt which is already so great as to endanger its economic life, if it is to be paid.

Finally there are those wise-sounding counsels of prudence to the effect that after all the United States has suffered a great deal from the war and has many obligations toward its own people. We ought first to consider what we must do for our veterans and to restore our economic life. If there is anything left over, then we may be generous with foreign nations, being careful to apportion our benefactions fairly among them. It would be rash to hasten into large obligations to Britain before we have had time to consider the situation as a whole.

This argument might be sound if three of its unexpressed premises were true; namely that money is identical with goods and services, that money lent abroad is the same as money spent at home, and that we already enjoy a condition of full employment and full production. If these three things were true, then we could offer aid to Britain and other nations only at sacrifice to ourselves. But of course none of them is true.

We shall have a difficult time achieving and maintaining full employment in any case. In order to do so, the amount of money spent must be very large. When the government makes money available for spending under less than full employment, it does not take goods and services away from the people, but actually increases the quantity of goods and services produced and consumed. If we help to finance Britain's imports, she will buy more from us; this will increase employment here and American consumers will also have more. It is true that we might achieve the same result without sending anything of value abroad if the money were spent at home instead of being sent to foreigners—provided our economy were so adjusted as to be completely efficient as a self-contained unit. It so happens, however, that we have actual or potential surpluses of some kinds of goods and shortages of others. We shall get full employment more quickly and maintain it more steadily if we now help Britain to get on her feet than if we do not.

The very people who issue these counsels of apparent prudence are often the ones who count most on exports for a resumption of American prosperity. One of them—Herbert Hoover—actually made it an official policy during his term of public office as Secretary of Commerce and President to give American goods away to foreigners by maintaining a high tariff and financing an export surplus with high-pressure foreign loans which could not be repaid. He did it when we did not need to do so, because we were enjoying the highest degree of prosperity the nation had ever experienced.

More solemn economic nonsense is being talked about the Anglo-American financial negotiations than has been heard for a decade. We advise those who feel moved to issue pronouncements on this subject to remain silent until they have indulged themselves in a little study of the elementary principles of foreign trade and finance.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: HEINZ EULAU, ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, HELEN FULLER (Washington)

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, MALCOLM COWLEY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, THOMAS SANCTON, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Detroit's Got 'Em Again

THE CONCURRENCE of two unrelated events in Detroit has given us another of that city's regular crises. This crisis served to expose our national reconversion jitters, and to remind government, industry and the public that the problem of maintaining purchasing power in this country, so assiduously avoided by Mr. Roosevelt, by his successor Mr. Truman, and by all their experts in Washington, is becoming pressing.

Event No. 1 in the production of the recent hysteria was the shutdown of the Ford Motor Company, which put 50,000 people out of work. The Ford plants closed because they couldn't get material from the Kelsey-Hayes wheel plant in Detroit, where 4,500 workers had been out for a month in one of those wacky strikes for which the CIO United Automobile Workers are justly renowned. The background of the Kelsey-Hayes strike is interesting. Some time last April, the lusty hands in that plant gave two foremen the heave-ho into the open air. The company fired thirteen of the boisterous fellows. The union appealed the firings to the War Labor Board, and the magistrates of this body ordered nine of the thirteen discharged workers reinstated. The discharges of the other four were confirmed. Three of these four want their jobs back, and the local union struck the plant, despite the findings of the WLB, to force the management to accept these three men. The mild persuasion of the international officers of the union could not bring the strikers back to work, and the case became a national embarrassment to the UAW when the Ford shutdown was front-paged all over the United States.

The international executive board of the UAW-CIO, beset by internal politics, shied away from drastic disciplinary measures against the Kelsey-Hayes local officials, and contented themselves with appointing an administrator for the local, who then took up the unhappy and uncertain task of trying to end the strike. The Kelsey-Hayes fiasco not only compromised the international-union officers, who had more important matters on their minds, but also furnished material for the enemies of Richard T. Frankensteen, the UAW vice-president who is a candidate for mayor of Detroit. But let a high official of the UAW sum up the whole labor-relations history of the Kelsey-Hayes plant. He told me warily, "They've never even been able to agree on a contract out there. The union and the management just beat each other over the head whenever either sees an opportunity."

Event No. 2 of the synthetic crisis was the announcement by UAW officials that they intended to ask the National Labor Relations Board to take a strike vote among the employees of the automobile industry's Big Three—General Motors, Chrysler and Ford. The union had already made a demand on the industry for a wage increase of 30 percent, and the announced plan of taking a strike vote (in accordance with the Smith-Connally Act) was merely a step in the war of nerves against the industry. A strike mandate is a powerful weapon in any wage negotiation. The mention of a strike, coming a few hours after Ford had dramatically closed up shop for want of supplies from a small strike-bound plant, produced a first-class crisis.

When the national goose pimples disappeared a few days later, all that was left was the glum realization of what some people have known all along, to wit:

Overtime pay, which had become an accustomed part of the American worker's budget, virtually disappeared from industry after V-J Day. The labor organizations whose members have taken a sharp pay cut in their return to the normal 40-hour week are determined that wages shall be increased to fill all or part of the gap made when overtime ceased.

Therein lies the essence of the whole wage crisis confronting the mass-production industries—steel, rubber, electrical manufacturing as well as automobiles.

There is no question but that there will be a general rise in wages in the next month or two. Industry, which did well in the war, even after taxes, seems to sense the inevitability of repairing some of the damage done to take-home pay after V-J Day. Two of the major oil companies, Socony-Vacuum and Standard of New Jersey, announced wage increases of from 10 to 15 percent early this month. Timken Roller Bearing of Canton, whose employees are in the CIO steel workers, offered a 10-percent increase even before Philip Murray filed notice on the industry that he wanted a $2-a-day increase (about 24 percent). And while all the noise was being made around Detroit, and a few hysterical people screamed that the Reuthers planned to destroy the automobile industry, Studebaker at South Bend, Indiana, was quietly negotiating a 10-cent-an-hour wage increase with the local union of the UAW. This is a boost of approximately 10 percent. It is authoritatively said that shortly after the UAW asked for a 30-percent increase in August, Ford representatives offered a 15-percent increase. The negotiations were dropped, however, when the OPA sent word to the labor-management conference that no increased costs of automobile production would be permitted to be passed on to the consumers.

The unions are maintaining that industry can raise wage rates without increasing prices. But it is reasonably safe to assume that the union leaders are not prepared to bleed and die for present OPA price levels. That, however, is for the future to tell. The auto

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers maintain that they will not compromise on a penny less than a 30-percent increase, but it is safe to assume that they'll settle for less, and possibly without even shutting down the industry.

The auto workers have a tactical advantage in their war of nerves. The Big Three of the automobile industry are a highly competitive group. By mid-October or November they will be entering the period of full production of new automobiles. None of the Big Three would care to be shut down in this period while its competitors rushed out into the hungry market with new cars. There was talk in Detroit last week of reviving the wartime united front of the industry to combat the UAW threat, but if history is any guide, the big companies will go their independent ways and be knocked off singly for wage increases by the union.

As the wage crisis boils up again next month, when the strike deadline nears, the chief issue in the negotiations will be: How big a tap can the industry stand?

Obviously, statistics on the industry's ability to pay are confusing, or there wouldn't be a crisis. Statisticians have a tendency to throw curves in favor of the people who hire them. Thus, a corporation economist can show you that industry is bled white by the tax collector and the workers. A union economist can take the same figures and display a corporation waxing fat with hidden war profits. A government economist, striving to be impartial, may merely baffle you.

One thing is reasonably certain—unless somebody hams up the act, there will be no emaciated babies crying for milk outside the doors while labor and management discuss wages in the automobile industry.

The automobile industry pays the highest wages of all the mass-production industries. Not because the heads of the corporations are Good Time Charleys, but first, because it is an efficient and profitable industry, and second, because the workers have a strong and militant organization, whose leaders are quick to put the muscle on the boss for a raise when they see an extra buck in the cash register.

The wage case for the auto workers was stated as follows by Walter P. Reuther, the red-headed thorn in the side of General Motors Corporation:

"Unless we maintain take-home pay, and thus bolster our fast shrinking ability to absorb the goods which we have the capacity to produce, we shall be forced into an economic crash that will make 1929-32 look like a minor recession."

Dollar wages in the auto industry are higher today, after the postwar shrinkage, than they were in 1939-40. The increase in the cost of living since then (including tax deductions from pay envelopes) has certainly wiped out a large part, if not all, of the money increase, but final conclusions on this point are unsafe.

In October, 1940, a busy "peacetime" period (the rest of the world was at war), the average weekly earnings in the industry were $39.24, and the average work week 41.3 hours, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The best earning period in the war was October, 1943, when average weekly earnings were $60.54 and the average work week was 48.2 hours. The most recent BLS figures available for the industry as a whole are for May, 1945, when the average weekly earnings were $55.60 and the average work week 43.9 hours. There has, of course, been a recession since V-J Day from the latter figures. The 40-hour week is now almost universal.

The wage statistics of individual corporations are even more interesting. The Ford Motor Company, according to union officers, has the highest wage rates in the industry. According to company statisticians, the average Ford worker on a 48-hour week before V-E Day had gross weekly earnings of $66.56. After tax and other deductions, his average take-home pay was $58.76. Since the reversion to a 40-hour week, the same worker has gross earnings of $51 a week, and a take-home of $46.81. The deflation in his pay envelope has amounted to $11.95 a week, or about 20 percent.

Chrysler Corporation estimates that in December, 1940, their average straight-time hourly rate was 96.6 cents, and for a 40-hour week the average worker's pay was $38.64. In August, 1945, the average straight-time hourly rate was $1.15. When the 48-hour week was in effect, a worker would earn 52 hours' pay (with the overtime rates), or $59.64. Since the company has reverted to 40 hours a week, the average weekly earnings are estimated at $45.80. This is 18.7 percent more than the worker earned in December, 1940, without counting the deductions for taxes that originated since that date. While the Little Steel formula permitted an increase of only 15 percent in wage rates, the cost of living has increased some 24 to 30 percent (according to conflicting estimates) since the base date for applying the formula, January 1, 1941.

The auto workers say that the industry can stand a 30-percent hike in its labor costs without raising prices because worker productivity has increased and the profit position of the industry greatly improved in the war. They cite government figures that the profits of General Motors in 1944, before taxes, increased 78 percent over the average profits of the corporation during 1936-1939. Profits after 1944 taxes were really about seven percent below the prewar average, but the net worth of the corporation increased by $235,092,444 during five war-production years.

Increase in worker productivity will, of course, be a sorely disputed point in the forthcoming wage negotiations, because the term also implies an increase in technological and managerial efficiency.

It is an elusive thing to measure, but the auto workers cite a War Production Board report which says that the volume of manufactures in the nation increased 150 percent from 1939 to 1944, while man-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours of work were increased less than 100 percent. The implication, naturally, is that the product of a day's work is greater than it was five years ago, and should be redistributed in wage increases. Also, the auto workers declare that a 25-percent increase in labor productivity was responsible for at least one-third of the total increase in output during the war.

The industry most certainly will dispute these figures in the wage negotiations. (Walter Reuther, incidentally, has proposed that these negotiations be thrown open to the general public, a suggestion not likely to be seriously considered.) In a Detroit hearing by the Senate War Investigating Committee last March, George Romney, managing director of the Automotive Council for War Production, summed up the grumpiness of management when he declared:

"The principal objective of the CIO postwar-plan drive is usurpation of the authority and functions of management. Stripped to its essentials, it is simply another proposal for government creation of a union-management-government board which would be responsible for 'taking the country through reconversion and managing peacetime production.'"

The question of sharing industry profits is difficult enough. But the evident bad feeling that has grown up between management and labor in the automobile industry during the war will make the forthcoming wage negotiations that much more bitter, and another Detroit crisis more certain in a very few weeks.

Detroit EDWIN A. LAHEY

Politics and Europe's Hunger

More than 100 million Europeans in liberated countries will go hungry this winter. Next year Americans will consume more food than ever before in their history. These two facts constitute political dynamite as well as human crime.

"Without food there can be no peace," General Eisenhower has warned. Informed spokesmen unanimously agree with him. Returning food officials report that there will be economic and political chaos as well as widespread starvation in Europe this winter unless the United States supplies the necessary quantities of food. Public-opinion polls show a majority of American citizens in favor of giving relief to stricken Europe even if it means doing without some things themselves. Yet the Administration is lagging on the job.

The nationalists in Congress are doing their best to block an adequate program, yet the President and his Secretary of Agriculture both seem more conscious of the political force set in motion by citizens irritated with rationing than by nations embittered by suffering. Millions of persons in the liberated areas have been living during the war years on low-calorie diets of from 1,400 to 1,700 calories, or less, per day. A 2,000-calorie diet is said by the Army emergency feeding staff to be the minimum to maintain health and avoid the conditions that lead to social unrest. United States food supplies sent to the Continent through the Army and Lend-Lease have played a big part in keeping Europe up to even its present inadequate diet standard. Now Lend-Lease has been abruptly stopped and Army supplies are no longer flowing to Europe as they did. Food production in Europe itself will be less for this year than at any time in a generation. To meet this emergency, President Truman has put forward a plan which is pitifully inadequate.

Europe faces a tougher winter in this year of its liberation than in any spent under Nazi domination. European food production has declined 15 percent below prewar levels, and two-thirds of the decline has come in 1945. If that decrease does not seem large, consider the fact that unequal distribution has forced urban areas to take almost the whole burden of the reduction. The decline in production is due partly to nature—severe drought in Southern Europe—partly to manpower troubles resulting from population shifts, plus lack of fertilizers, farm animals, machinery, transportation, and especially coal. The Dutch could not pump their flooded farm lands dry without coal for the electric pumps. The French could not turn their beets into sugar without coal for the processing. Miners were too badly fed to increase coal production.

The same condition prevailed in all heavy industries. Plainly European rehabilitation was contingent on a more adequate food supply. The National Research Council reported to the Foreign Economic Administration here that on the basis of what Europe can produce for itself, without heavy imports, in six months' time adult European males will be reduced in endurance "to the point where only very light work can be performed effectively."

To rebuild the health of the peoples of Europe sufficiently to enable them to do the necessary work of repair and reconstruction, at least 15 million tons of imported foods will be required next year, the independent experts of the Food for Freedom Committee state. That amount, they say, would only keep people functioning; it would not restore prewar levels of consumption. Grain, meat, fats, oils and dairy products are the largest items in their 15-million-ton schedule of needs. The 5.25 million tons of non-grain foods included represent, according to the experts, "the minimum amount necessary . . . to halt the terrible plague of tuberculosis now sweeping Europe, and to build resistance against all other diseases."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Until now, it has been impossible for American citizens, concerned that we do our part to feed those who fought Hitler for us while we prepared to fight, to find out what our government was actually planning. Allocation of food had been secret information until a few days ago, when President Truman issued an announcement on aid to Europe that contained the first official indication of the exact quantities to be sent. This in itself is a definite step forward.

Mr. Truman's statement was issued the day after a delegation representing 27 large national organizations had called on him to demand speed in sending the necessary food abroad, and it is in the nature of a reply to their criticisms. It gives a technically accurate and plausible picture of the situation and our position in relation to it. But the shipments it schedules for the fourth quarter of 1945 are totally inadequate.

The President himself admits that "these supplies will serve not to improve but only to sustain the diet of the liberated peoples, which remains below the minimum level of subsistence." The Department of Agriculture, he says, will ship in the fourth quarter about 2.5 million short tons of food, about seven-eighths of which will be wheat. That is to be compared with the 3.75 million tons the Food for Freedom experts say represents the minimum needs for the same length of time. Seventy-five thousand of the 2.5 million tons will be meat. The independent experts called for three times that amount as the minimum, and many times more dried peas and beans, fats, oils and sugar. The President states that 190,000 tons of cheese and milk products will be shipped "as soon as financial arrangements have been satisfactorily completed." But even with such arrangements, the schedule falls more than 100,000 tons short of what is needed.

The President also admits that the limiting factor in meeting the minimum needs of the liberated peoples "is no longer one of shipping . . . and, in the case of most commodities, it is no longer a problem of supply. Today it is primarily a twofold financial problem." In other words, we are all for being Good Samaritans, but strictly on a C. O. D. basis.

The latest estimates are that our food production in 1945 will be 33 percent above the 1935-39 average. Army cutbacks resulting from the sudden end of the war have also freed large quantities of food—for the last quarter of this year, 25 percent of what had been scheduled. The amounts Truman reports we are planning to send Europe are the merest trifle in terms of our resources. The meat and lard allocations amount to only 0.6 percent of our estimated production for 1945; the dairy products equal only 5 percent; the sugar, 0.3 percent of our 1945 supply; and the wheat and dried beans 6 percent.

As the President remarked, we can deliver all this without creating any special need for rationing. But experts point out that if we allocated adequate quantities of food for Europe this winter, it would mean continued rationing here of meats, fats and oils, and sugar, and probably the return of cheese to the ration list as well. Item by item, investigation shows that once stringent financial barriers are removed, demands from both UNRRA and the so-called "paying countries" of Western Europe—Belgium, the Netherlands, France and Norway—not eligible for UNRRA, will quickly wipe out these allocation reserves. And heavy home consumption will have used up the extra food supply that was not placed on allocation.

Financial problems have now been allowed to become so formidable that there is danger they will choke up the supply pipeline to Europe. The abrupt manner in which Lend-Lease was abolished caught most non-UNRRA countries without any substitute method of financing. Even those nations able to pay in gold find it difficult to get food allocations from us. There is a stop-gap arrangement at present, with the Commodity Credit Corporation underwriting purchases up to $250 million, which will probably prevent the pipeline from running dry for the present. Administrative detail is in danger of being allowed to cut off Europe's urgently needed supplies.

Our government still owes UNRRA $550 million, which has been authorized but not appropriated to it. Until it is paid, UNRRA lacks enough cash to requisition the additional foodstuffs it needs to buy here. And in addition, to meet next year's relief needs, UNRRA has asked the United States, along with other member nations, to appropriate an additional one percent of its income. Congress has both these items before it. President Truman thus far has said only that the UNRRA request "is fully justified." The Administration will need to put much more heart than that into its support for UNRRA to win. For the nationalist-economy forces are mobilizing to attack our very membership in UNRRA.

In concluding his aid-to-Europe statement, Mr. Truman declares that "It is an American responsibility not only to our friends but to ourselves to see that this job is done and done quickly." Proof of his own good faith rests on whether he will insist on:

1. Prompt and full grant of appropriations to UNRRA.

2. Quick financial arrangements with the other countries that will not cripple them as did the First World War loans.

3. Much larger food allocations to Europe now, even if it means continued rationing at home.

There will be hundreds of thousands of hungry people in Europe this winter. We can do much, much more in providing relief and still have a better diet at home than we had even during the lush wartime years. America can offer no excuse to the rest of the world if she fails to live up to this basic responsibility.

Washington HELEN FULLER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Labor's Foreign Policy

MR. BEVIN'S MAIDEN SPEECH as Foreign Secretary, delivered in the House on August 20, was coolly received by the Left in Britain. It met with a correspondingly warm welcome on the Tory benches and in the Tory press. It was also greeted with apparent relief and satisfaction by Franco Spain, the Greek monarchists and the Hearst press and their allies, and was seriously criticized in the Soviet papers and by American liberal opinion. Friend and foe alike took the speech as denoting the intention of the Labor government to follow in the footsteps of the Tories. "With a bigness of spirit which has always been his," wrote the *Daily Mail* rapturously next day, "he [Bevin] proclaims frankly that Labor policy in world affairs is that laid down by Mr. Eden, his predecessor."

I venture to believe that this almost universal assumption is at least premature and probably mistaken. A new government and ministers fresh to their departments must start by "carrying on" with the old policy and letting things run on their own momentum until they learn their jobs, the facts of the situation and the way their departments work well enough to start introducing changes. Most ministers can keep quiet until their period of incubation is ended and they have hatched a policy of their own. But the Foreign Secretary had to accompany the Prime Minister to Potsdam in order to complete a job already half done by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden. On his return he had to make a statement on British foreign policy the moment the House met, because the world wanted to know. In the circumstances he was hardly in a position to announce any startling innovations.

A second point to bear in mind is that the Labor Party has now formed a government of its own after being in a coalition with the Conservatives for five years, and a very successful coalition too. It even succeeded in pledging all parties to common aims in domestic and foreign policy alike. As a consequence, the Labor government must begin in both home and foreign affairs by announcing its intention to pursue the aims proclaimed by the coalition from which it has issued.

That does not necessarily mean national unity or continuity in foreign policy any more than in home affairs. In foreign affairs all parties are agreed upon implementing the decisions of the Potsdam proposals, on making the best of the Charter of the United Nations and working to preserve unity within the Big Five as the foundation for peace; on the need for unifying and reconstructing Europe on democratic lines. But do all parties propose to achieve these common aims by the same methods? Is their difference at home over the issue of nationalization v. private enterprise irrelevant to their views on foreign policy? Or is it a worldwide issue being fought out by other means in other lands, but fundamentally the same issue as the one on which the British people gave their verdict at the general election? The Labor Party in its official statement on foreign policy, entitled "The International Postwar Settlement," declares that socialism is a fundamental necessity for the attainment of our international as well as our domestic aims. Do we mean what we say?

Mr. Bevin is an incomparably more powerful man than Mr. Eden, with a massive intellect and a well stored mind. His whole record and approach to public affairs are so different from Mr. Eden's that even if foreign affairs were the personal prerogative of the Foreign Secretary, his policy would not be the same as that of his predecessor.

Mr. Bevin may be a first-class disaster or the greatest Foreign Secretary of modern times. But he will be one or the other, and he will certainly not be the same as the elegant, amiable and pliant aristocrat, Anthony Eden. I believe he may be a great success, not least because foreign policy nowadays raises vast matters embracing so many aspects of public affairs that the larger issues are determined collectively by the cabinet as a "function" of their general policies. Mr. Bevin is far too good a democrat and too shrewd and experienced a negotiator to ignore this fact or to cast aside the party's own declared foreign policy as framed by the National Executive and approved by the annual conference as recently as last December. A review of the main questions of foreign policy today in the light of Labor's known attitude and commitments, the relevant facts of the situation and Mr. Bevin's own views may throw some light on the lines along which the Labor government's foreign policy is likely to develop.

For instance, the decisions of the Potsdam Conference on the future of Germany should be read in conjunction with Mr. Bevin's strongly and frequently expressed view—at a luncheon to the delegates to the World Trade Union Conference last spring; at the Blackpool Conference of the Labor Party, and again in his speeches in the House as Foreign Secretary—that whereas the German people must realize their responsibility and do all in their power to make good the appalling material damage inflicted by their rulers on their neighbors, it would be wrong and disastrous to turn Germany into an economic slum, with mass unemployment and subsistence at starvation level. There can be no doubt that when Mr. Bevin speaks of restoring democratic rights and freedoms, including trade unions, in Germany, he really means it, and is not in favor of using this formula as a surreptitious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cover for supporting assorted reactionaries in order to preserve the old social order.

The keynote of all his speeches on foreign affairs has been his profoundly human approach to international relations. Mr. Bevin sees them in terms of the workers and the common people everywhere uprooted, disorganized, jobless, homeless and largely foodless, and thinks of foreign affairs, not in terms of power politics and abstract reasons of state, but as a direct extension beyond British frontiers of Labor's policies in regard to economic organization, social justice, jobs and homes for all.

On the atomic-bomb issue Mr. Bevin was unsatisfactory, perhaps inevitably, in that he acquiesced for the time being in the position that the secret of the atomic bomb should not be communicated to the Soviet Union. But he did say very positively that the whole matter should be submitted to and discussed by the New World Organization as soon as it was working. It is difficult to quarrel with that policy in principle, and it is certain that there will be tremendous pressure from the Labor Party and public opinion for a British lead in pooling knowledge and research on this subject.

On Hong Kong Mr. Bevin was careful not to commit himself to any long-range policy, but merely asked for the return of the colony to British administration at the present moment. The Labor Party is not likely to press for the return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty before the Chinese themselves officially demand it. But if there were a strong and insistent Chinese demand, especially if it were backed by the Americans and the Russians, it is inconceivable that a Labor government could ignore the justice of the claim or be blind to the unwisdom of being intransigent in refusal. It is quite certain that a large number of Labor back-benchers would demand a compromise on the lines of the Soviet-Chinese arrangements for joint administration for thirty years of the Chinese-Eastern Railway and Port Arthur, after which they are to revert to China's undivided possession. Similar considerations apply to returning the leased territory of Kowloon to Chinese sovereignty, about which the Chinese are more likely to press their claims now than over Hong Kong.

As regards India, the Labor Party is of course pledged to grant full dominion status, including the right of self-determination as to whether or not India wishes to remain in the Empire, and is taking tentative steps to implement that pledge.[1] The Labor government, or at least a large part of its parliamentary majority, would be far readier than the Tories to accept the view that the problem of India's relationship to this country is a matter of international concern.

[1] Since this article was written, the Labor government, through Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee, on September 19, announced that the forthcoming Indian elections will be followed by "positive steps to set up a constituent assembly . . . charged with the task of framing a new Constitution." — THE EDITORS

As for colonies, Mr. Bevin replied with a very guarded and qualified affirmative to the request of Mr. Oliver Stanley, the former Tory Colonial Minister, that he give a pledge that no British colony would be put under the international-trusteeship system until we had had much more experience of the workings of the present system and until we could see much more clearly that it would be to our advantage and the advantage of the colonial empire. There Mr. Bevin came perilously close to disavowing the Labor Party's declared policy on this issue, contained in a report issued by the National Executive and adopted by the annual conference in 1943. This colonial policy provided for putting all non-self-supporting colonies under a system of international trusteeship, provided other countries were prepared to do the same, and applying to them the principle of the Open Door, subject to the overriding rights of the native inhabitants. The International Trusteeship Council should be charged with investigating whether any particular measure of economic discrimination were necessary in the interests of the native inhabitants, with a right of appeal to the Permanent Court in case of disputes rising out of such investigation. This policy would infuse honesty and vitality into the hypocrisy of Chapter 12, Articles 66 and 67 of the Charter, which today are mere high-sounding camouflage for allowing the victor states to help themselves to the colonies of their ex-enemies and to put them within their own imperial-preference systems.

On the issue of democracy in Europe, particularly in Eastern Europe, Mr. Bevin used language indistinguishable from that of the previous government and closely similar to the strictures passed by Mr. Churchill and Secretary of State Byrnes on the present regimes in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania and Hungary. But he did add the warning that it was unreasonable to expect Western parliamentary democracy to be reproduced in the conditions of Eastern Europe. It was pointed out in the debate that the political formulas of Western democracy, displaced from their social context, can mean anything or nothing, and had in fact been used by the Tories as cover for intervention in Russia at the end of the last war, as an excuse for the appeasement of the fascist regimes and for non-interference against fascist intervention in Spain, in the name of "not taking sides in the ideological conflict." The Labor government was urged to make it clear that whereas it was nearer to the United States so far as regarding political democracy and civil liberties as essential to the revival of civilization in Europe, it shared with the Soviet Union the view that economic reconstruction can succeed only on the basis of a substantial advance toward socialism. It should be made clear that in no circumstances and under no pretext whatever would British-controlled economic and mili-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary power be used to bolster up reaction and counter-revolution in Europe.

The least that can be said about Mr. Bevin's references to Greece was that they were unsatisfactory from this point of view. Mr. Churchill conducted intervention in Greece on the side of Royalists, Quislings, reactionaries and near-fascists by the use of armed force and false propaganda, smashed the Resistance movements, enthroned the forces of the Right and duped our Labor leaders into sharing responsibility for this policy. The Labor government is trying to make the present gang in Greece carry out their promises. But it is being systematically misled by the Foreign Office officials on the spot, whose information is tainted and unreliable. Unless the government takes far more drastic measures, and indeed reverses the whole purpose and methods of British policy and removes some of the persons chiefly responsible, it is riding for a fall in Greece. There are several members in the House who have had direct experience of the whole shameful business in Greece and are prepared to become extremely tough on the subject this autumn unless the situation greatly improves in the meantime.

As regards Franco Spain, Mr. Bevin endorsed the statement of the Potsdam Conference that the Franco regime cannot be admitted to the United Nations because it was founded with the support of Hitler and Mussolini and because of its nature, its record and its close association with the aggressor states. He added the blunt statement that "We shall take a favorable view if steps are taken by the Spanish people to change their regime," but disavowed any intention of direct intervention. That attitude was satisfactory to the Spanish Republicans and to most people in Britain.

On a longer view, perhaps the most significant statement by Mr. Bevin was his remark at Blackpool that "The United States of America is a country which believes in private enterprise. The Soviet Union has socialized her internal economy. Britain stands between the two, with a tremendously progressive chance toward the socialized economy we need." The same point was stressed by Ellen Wilkinson, speaking for the government in the House on the United Nations Charter: "We in this country were credited at San Francisco . . . with standing midway between the two extremes of the economic system." She, like Mr. Bevin, drew the conclusion that special responsibility rested on Great Britain for keeping the United States and the Soviet Union from drifting apart.

The abrupt cessation of Lend-Lease has provoked a general feeling that it is now up to us to draw closer to the Soviet Union, to the dominions and to our European neighbors. One Tory, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, expressed sentiments that can only be described as "inverted interventionism," that is, a thinly concealed desire that American pressure should be brought to bear to force our Labor government to put its socialist ideas into cold storage and give capitalism a free hand, as in the United States. The government's own reaction seems to be to desire to cut down purchases in America to a minimum, to develop our economic relations with the sterling bloc to a maximum, and to superimpose control of exports and imports on the existing exchange controls. As a corollary there is more talk than ever of either not ratifying the Bretton Woods International Stabilization Fund Agreement, or attaching to our ratification the reservation that at the end of the five-year transition period we shall bring its provisions fully into operation only with regard to states that: (a) have accepted an international obligation to maintain full employment and agree that a figure of 10 percent or more unemployed shall be regarded as failure to fulfill that obligation; (b) are balancing their accounts in the international market.

In addition there is talk of denouncing the most-favored-nation clause in our commercial treaties and substituting a revised most-favored-nation clause on the lines proposed just before the war by the League of Nations Economic Committee. According to this revised clause, a group of states may grant one another tariff preferences, provided the reduced rates are open to any other state that makes equivalent cuts in its tariffs in favor of the members of the group; provided that in establishing lower tariffs toward one another the group do not raise their tariffs toward the rest of the world; and provided finally that any state with tariffs no higher than the preferential rates accorded by the members of the group to one another shall unconditionally benefit by those rates.

This revised most-favored-nation clause would enable us to enter into some kind of British Commonwealth-cum-West European low-tariff sterling bloc and common economic planning group, which could then bargain with the United States for a mutual lowering of tariffs. The conditional adherence to the Bretton Woods Agreement would give us a further bargaining weapon to protect ourselves against being dragged down in the next American slump, which we all believe will be the direct and inevitable result of removing controls and letting capitalism rip.

The phrase, "Our Reconstruction Dunkirk," is used freely over here and typifies the prevailing mood—we feel that we are up against it and alone. We shall have to tighten our belts, reduce our already lowered standard of living and work hard. The temptation will be great to blame our troubles on the United States and thereby to enlist nationalism on behalf of our socialist reconstruction. Any attempt to use Lend-Lease debts, or our immediate necessities in the way of food, to put pressure on us to abandon our idea of what is necessary for successful reconstruction and the policy for which the British people have given us a mandate would incalculably strengthen that temptation.

London K. ZILLIACUS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress Grapples with Science

PUBLIC APPRECIATION of science had its small beginning in man's infancy, possibly with some such event as the rising of the moon foretold to his neighbors by some herdsman watching the stars. It reached a portentous crescendo with the story of the atomic bomb and of its stupendous performance exactly as had been anticipated by those who developed it. Millions of people, and some of them the world's least educated, saw in the events at Alamogordo in the desert of Arizona, at Hiroshima and at Nagasaki, a completely satisfactory definition of science and the harbinger of great things to be. The life of man on earth seemed to have turned a master page.

The influence of these events has been immediate on a Congress which during the last three years has been indifferent to legislation proposing to correlate all current federal, civil and military scientific activities and to increase them greatly. The Kilgore bill, now the Kilgore-Johnson-Pepper bill, and measures sponsored by Senators Byrd, Fulbright and Magnuson, plus a fifth bill already passed by the House, have been scheduled for joint hearings early in October. It is no longer a question of whether there is to be legislation in behalf of science, but rather what shall be its character.

There are congressmen who sense the validity of the scientific approach to individual peacetime problems, such as malaria control or tree culture. There are almost none, however, who realize the controlling place which science might play in conserving natural resources, increasing the food supply, building up the public health, shortening the work day and otherwise easing a life that is still very grim for the bulk of mankind. This fact makes the forthright struggle put up in committee by Senator Kilgore during the past three years worthy of high commendation. He seeks to have the government map out the whole field of science in order to reveal the gaps in our knowledge, and then contract with the best men available to fill them—a practice so brilliantly followed in our wartime research.

The really significant issues involved in the pending science legislative proposals are posed in the wording of the Kilgore and Magnuson bills and in the character of the support which these two measures command at the moment. They are the major bills. It is between their respective supporters that the coming battle will be fought. The Magnuson bill represents pretty largely the views of Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war, as outlined in "Science—The Endless Frontier," a report, made at the request of President Roosevelt, on future government policy as to science. Senator Byrd's bill sets up a research board for national security only. A bill, already passed by the House under Mr. May's leadership, and having no specified Senate sponsorship, authorizes the National Academy of Sciences to set up a security board "by agreement with the Army and Navy." The Fulbright bill provides for a bureau of scientific research within the Department of Commerce to make itself useful to business, "particularly small and medium-sized enterprises."

The major bills both provide for a central science foundation having as its concern the development of the mathematical, physical, biological and medical sciences as they affect both preparation for war and the conduct of our peacetime economy. Both assume it to be sound policy not to depend wholly on the Army and Navy for effective military preparations resulting from scientific research and both also provide for scholarships in technical institutions of learning. Senator Magnuson provides that the beneficiaries are to be included in a National Science Reserve available for call in times of national emergency. At a time when the better ordering of our society is of major importance, one wonders whether the time may not come when the drafters of such legislation will regret their failure to include the social sciences within their field of inquiry. Rumor has it that this omission may be corrected before the bill leaves the committee stage. The Kilgore measure specifies that 20 percent of the monies available shall be used for medical research and a like amount for national-defense problems. Senator Magnuson provides that such allocations are to be determined from time to time by the Board.

Both as to the type of organization recommended for the science foundation and as to patents resulting from the expenditure of federal funds, the major bills come to grips with radically divergent philosophies of public administration. The problems involved are not only so grave as to threaten the authority of the federal government but, in their size and influence, are essentially new to our times.

Senator Kilgore provides that the work of the science board shall be administered by a high-salaried director appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The director will "consult and advise" with a board "on all matters of major policy or program." The board, in addition to the director, will consist of eight highly placed government officials—for the most part of cabinet rank—and eight others appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, all to serve without salaried compensation. A seemingly weak point in this bill is that there is nothing to suggest the character or type of the competence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the members of the board who do not already hold public office. The latter could well take care of the lay point of view. The others should therefore represent some sector of the scientific field. One can envision a board appointed under the Kilgore bill whose members might know nothing of science. Of course such an outcome is not intended. The responsibility for results under the bill lies largely with the director, who reports to the President and through him to Congress. The organizational pattern does not vary much from what is common throughout our government.

The Magnuson bill, already introduced in the House by Representatives Mills and Randolph, provides for a board of nine members appointed by the President "on the basis of demonstrated capacity for the job and not on ex-officio basis." This board, made up exclusively of those "with an understanding of the peculiarities of scientific research and education," will choose its own director. Neither the board members nor the director will require Senate confirmation. The philosophical set-up runs quite parallel to that of the existing National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council except that the boards of the Academy and the Council are self-perpetuating, while the board provided for in the Magnuson bill is to be appointed by the President, presumably from names submitted by the Academy or those holding strong fealty to it. The Magnuson bill reflects the quite natural confidence of scientists in scientists and their not always recognized lack of understanding either of politicians or democratic processes.

The highly technical specifications for members of the board in the Magnuson bill, the exclusion of ex-officio members and the failure to require confirmation by the Senate, all indicate the desire of organized science to maintain its complete detachment from government except in the matter of appropriations. This is almost a replica of the attitude of business in wanting to be let alone by government except when there are contracts to be given out or protective tariffs to be drafted. This poses the question as to what might possibly happen to government—by, of and for the people—in these days of marvelous technical developments if both top science and big business should be financed and/or subsidized by government and without the appropriate administrative controls. This problem would not disturb the president of the National Association of Manufacturers and it evidently does not disturb President Conant of Harvard, who recently said, "Whether or not such research should be in the hands of the federal government depends on whether or not the United States wishes to go as far down the road to socialism as do our British friends across the sea."

The attitude of science reflected in the Magnuson bill stems very largely from the relationship which scientists—and engineers too—bear to the hurly-burly of American life. They are only dimly aware of how detached they are individually, and as a profession, from the pulsating world around them. In the days when science was persecuted, the scientist was a recluse living as far as possible from the haunts of men. He still lives a life apart, sharing almost not at all in our common activities, and assuming no responsibility for the conduct of affairs outside the narrow confines of his own professional interest. Decisions dictated by slide rules and test tubes are his daily meat. Labor unions and especially politics are anathema. The scientists, with few exceptions, feel no responsibility whatever for the life of the community—the hospitals, the boys' clubs, the forums for the discussion of public questions, the homes for the aged. Statistical proofs of this situation are multiplying. With peace the dominant concern of mankind, no scientific organization was represented at San Francisco and among 400 consultants and advisers to our government there was not one scientist. Possibly because of this, science and engineering were all but ignored in plans for the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The government is the only large-scale employer in the United States of America that does not insist that all patents resulting from scientific research become the property of the employer. It has been our traditional policy from early days. The Kilgore bill seeks to change this and to require that patents growing out of the expenditure of public funds be assigned to the government as requested by President Truman in his recent message: "Make fully, freely and publicly available to commerce, industry, agriculture and academic institutions the fruits of research financed by federal funds." In making this change, Uncle Sam will follow the example of duPont, General Electric, U. S. Steel and a host of others. It is as simple as that. It does not involve rewriting the patent law as claimed by some. The practice has already been adopted by the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Interior.

Those who oppose this provision of the Kilgore bill claim that industrial concerns, particularly in peacetime, would be loath to accept contracts in a field they had previously investigated if it meant turning all resulting patents over to Uncle Sam. Proponents of the Kilgore measure say that the shoe is on the other foot and that our wartime experience shows that the size of government expenditures during the war on specific research projects so far outweighed any previous outlays by the private concern that no injustice resulted. In what are held to be the exceptional cases it is claimed that the equities can be protected through contract specifications. During the war, the government expended on scientific research and development more than $2 billion, in addition to what was spent on the atomic bomb. The expenditures of private industry for research during the entire decade of the thirties did not reach this figure. Certainly the scale on which funds

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for research have been turned over during the war to a number of our largest industrial establishments—$80 million to A.T. and T., for instance—has strengthened their monopoly positions, patents or no patents. The Magnuson bill, except by implication, does not mention patents.

There is nothing in this bill which suggests any supervision of the scientific research that is now carried on throughout the federal establishment, while Senator Kilgore assumes some measure of responsibility for research wherever carried on with government funds. The director is given authority to inquire into, and the right to know about, federal research activities wherever located.

Very low bows are made by everybody connected with this legislation to what is now called fundamental or basic research as contrasted with applied research. Apparently the term "pure research" no longer has the standing it had when Harvard possessed a distinguished pure-science faculty. The proponents of both bills admit the absolute necessity for promoting basic research, but as to how it is to be done, views vary. The Bush-Magnuson coterie look upon basic discoveries as most likely to pop up in collegiate atmospheres—better still "in austere isolation." Such discoveries are said to result from intelligent guessing and a kind of inspired curiosity. According to this school of thought, those permitted to seek after basic truths should not be hampered by *demands* for results of any kind whatsoever, or by the necessity for application, or by any rules, time tables or specifications. This may sound humorous, but there is a whole lot to it. Let the Republic forget this at its peril. The less esoteric Kilgore group, on the other hand, argue that basic theories have quite frequently resulted from well organized scientific studies carried on in answer to some immediate purpose. They hold that the scientist, delving deep into some practical problem, is on occasion almost forced into a basic discovery.

Senator Kilgore contemplates utilizing government agencies and educational institutions as largely as possible, for he stipulates that 50 percent of the funds available shall go to non-profit educational and research institutions. The effort will be made to allocate funds so as to build up the smaller institutions. Our wartime allocations, perhaps necessarily, operated to increase the size of laboratories and schools already full grown—five institutions received 70 percent of the money. This resulted in many instances in drawing off the better workers from the smaller institutions.

Both sides agree that the subject to be investigated and the general area of inquiry to be covered can properly be stipulated. Both sides also agree that interference with methods to be followed and the personnel to be employed would be against good practice. Outright grants, of course without strings of any sort whatever, are what our colleges have been accustomed to. Senator Kilgore holds that many an institution would profit by more or less standardized contractual stipulations. He feels the smaller institutions usually profit the most by disinterested assistance of this kind. Perhaps the Hayden-Cartright Act, which inaugurated federal aid to the states for highway construction, may illustrate one wholly beneficial type of control. Here it was stipulated that before any federal advances were made, an agency should be set up within the state adequately empowered to act affirmatively on relations with the Bureau of Roads. "No buck-passing" was the slogan. By the same token the federal science board is entitled to do business in the case of any contract with an educational institution through an adequately constituted and authorized agency.

If, as some hold, and I am one of them, most types of human work—not all of course—are better for being planned and, especially in spending government funds, the less laissez-faire the better, this question of government relations with educational institutions and how far they should go becomes one of considerable moment. As in all really important matters, good arguments are found on each side. The radical administrative and pedagogical improvements made within the last generation suggest that our colleges, in common with most other human institutions, are moving their historic moorings. Judged by what will probably be the standards of a world either inspired or controlled by nuclear physics, I assume that we are all going to have to restudy our courses. One conclusion which most people are likely to reach is that an atmosphere absolutely the best for a Faraday, a Kelvin or an Einstein might be quite demoralizing for the garden variety of science workers with or without a Ph.D. Senators Kilgore and Magnuson between them may do our colleges a lot of good if we do not stir up too much heat in the process.

The trend of events and public opinion seemingly will fairly soon force both the scientists and the engineers to abandon their isolated positions and take a hand in those arenas in which are threshed out the major decisions affecting American life and the future of democracy. If these groups have the power to create havoc on the Hiroshima scale, it is clear that they also have the power to create a new and better life for man on earth. They must get to know "us folks" and we must get to know them. And this must take place not only in their laboratories and at their Goodhue-designed and Carnegie-financed temple at 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C., but also in market places and legislative halls, wherever they may be. Gossip has it that no congressman has ever set foot in the American Academy of Sciences. May the evening soon come when this beautiful building will be brilliantly illuminated for one of its periodical Congressional Nights.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Alternative in Rumania

THE REFUSAL, last week, of King Michael of Rumania to sign any decrees of the Soviet-backed Groza government is not, as the daily press has reported, a single-handed stand to force a showdown in that country's internal politics. Rather, according to reliable information that has reached us, the King is acting on advice from, and is supported by, Juliu Maniu, the leader of the National Peasant Party. This information gives an altogether new perspective on the King's demand that the Groza government resign and free elections be held.

As long as Michael's motivation for making his demands was unknown, there was good reason for giving the benefit of the doubt to the Groza government. The role of the monarchy in Rumanian politics has too often been adverse to the best interests of the people. It not only tolerated, but supported, both the alliance with Hitler and fascism at home. While it is true that Michael played a prominent part in the ousting of the fascist Premier Ion Antonescu and Rumania's capitulation, his appointments of Generals Sanatescu and Radescu, Groza's predecessors, were not reassuring.

As long as it seemed, therefore, that Rumania's alternatives were between a monarchical-reactionary, possibly neo-fascist, anti-Russian regime and the Soviet-sponsored, Communist-controlled left-wing Groza government, the latter, for a number of reasons, must have appeared preferable to foreign observers. It alone seemed capable of solving the country's urgent social and economic problems, especially overdue administrative and agrarian reforms, even though its revolution came from above and not from below. In no other Balkan country did peasant misery, bureaucratic brutality, false education and a privileged class lacking social responsibility and willing to betray its principles in exchange for the spoils of office, exist to such a degree as in Rumania. No other country was riper for social revolution. Democracy, of course, could not flourish in this atmosphere. And as democracy cannot be created in a vacuum, some sort of dictated revolution—even if it meant severe restrictions on liberty as we regard it—seems a temporary prerequisite to the introduction of democratic institutions.

But why, one may properly ask, does the left-wing Groza government not include all democratic forces, especially representatives of the Peasant Party? The answer can only be given in terms of historical Russian-Rumanian relations. Rightly or wrongly, Russia's attitude toward her neighbor is one of profound distrust. The Russians apparently cannot forget that at the peace settlement after the First World War, Rumania fared better than any other Eastern European country. Her success was largely due to the panic about Bolshevism among the Western powers, and for the following 20 years Rumanian statesmen exploited the Bolshevik bogey to receive material benefits from these nations. She was the mainstay of the *cordon sanitaire* which the Allies drew around the Soviet Union.

In this policy, the role of the Peasant Party, and of Maniu in particular, was, to say the least, ambiguous. It was the Peasant Party government—which had come to power in 1927 after an election which had given it a majority of more than 75 percent—which decided to throw the country open to foreign capital. This, writes the eminent English historian, Hugh Seton-Watson, "was Maniu's main achievement, which won him the undying affection of British, French and American capitalists." Later, of course, when Maniu, the inflexible and incorruptible patriot, opposed the dictatorship of King Carol II, they refused to support him, but they retained warm feelings for him. "What a pity," they would say with condescending approval, "that he is so obstinate."

This same obstinacy characterizes Maniu today and explains his refusal to participate in a Russian-backed government. Maniu is probably right in refusing to be a Russian puppet. On the other hand, his participation in the government might counteract whatever dictatorial aspirations the Communists may have. Maniu and the Peasant Party, in order to be effective in a social-revolutionary situation such as exists today in Rumania, and which clearly demands bold action, must certainly give up some of the rigidly held concepts of constitutional regularity. Democracy can be aborted by default as easily as by design. The Russians, in turn, should realize—as they have elsewhere—that a man like Maniu, who admittedly has a much larger popular following than all the groups supporting the Groza government combined, is more likely to ensure Rumania's internal stability and friendship with the USSR than could any puppet regime.

In a situation as complex as the Rumanian, stereotyped solutions will not do. This is advice which the Russians, the Anglo-American powers and Maniu's Peasant Party should all take to heart. A Russian-imposed left-wing dictatorship cannot endure as long as a large sector of the Left is excluded. On the other hand, it would be folly to expect immediate democratic government in the Anglo-American sense such as Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Bevin seem to have had in mind when they lumped Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary together in demanding free elections as a necessary condition for Anglo-American recognition. It may well be that in a country like Rumania the alternative to Communist dictatorship or to democracy after the Western model is for the present a new type of political organization which, while avoiding the extremist implications of one-party government, is not a complete copy of Western democracy. This new type of political organization has had a chance to develop, in all the Southeastern European countries, out of the underground

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resistance movements—the Partisan Movement in Yugoslavia, the Liberation Movement in Greece, the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria and the National Democratic Front in Rumania. These movements, though not democratic in the Western sense, were broadly representative of the anti-fascist forces at the time of liberation. They contained the basis for democracy so long as the Communists did not manipulate them as vehicles for their dictatorial aspirations.

There is still time to redirect these movements in the direction which had originally been set for them. Insistence on their original objective rather than democracy in the Western sense—whose present workability in Southeastern Europe is open to question—should be the policy of the Anglo-American powers. The Russians, if Bulgaria is a fair precedent, will not object to such a policy. This, then, is the practical alternative in Rumania—the Peasant Party willing.

HEINZ EULAU

Reconversion of a Bomber Pilot

FROM HERE, upon the threshold of my new life or perhaps the return to an old one, I look about me as a man whose eyes have not become accustomed to the change of light. All those peaceful things which used to seem so real are now dim forms, as though only half-suggestions of my imagination. They don't compare to the things which are my new realities.

I remember August 1, 1943: that was real. I was in Rumania—not really in Rumania I guess, but over it. I remember Lieutenant "Pete" Hughes flying on my right wing as we skimmed low over houses and turned our noses into the cloud of fire and smoke of the burning, flashing, detonating oil refinery a few feet below. Pete had a fuel leak when he went in and of course his plane caught fire and exploded a short distance beyond the target. His wife received his Congressional Medal. Since I was of less account and of more craven heart, fate determined I should return.

And I can remember other real things, like when we were coming out of the dark corridor of flak over Berlin. My headphones were filled with calls of: "Guess the jig is up," "On fire, bailing out," "Enemy fighters everywhere."

Again it seems my current set of realities is obsolete and I have new ones to grasp. They are similar in content to the ones I knew before the war, and yet they seem only vaguely the same. At present I fear my mind cannot stretch far enough to catch the ideas tossed at it—ideas like: "Somebody's going to have to do something to put these niggers back in their place." . . . "When are we going to stop this spending?" . . . "How are we ever going to carry this national debt?" and "Some of these young fellows without even a college education who have been making four hundred a month and more as pilots and bombardiers are going to be a real problem out of uniform."

The other day a wealthy man from Grosse Point said to me: "I think we'd better declare war on Russia, and do it quick, don't you?"

I'm sure the people who say these things are in a sense good people and probably have the average and therefore the admittedly "sane" point of view. The effect of it all on me is that it makes me question my own sanity. Granting we had no principle in fighting the war except to strike back vindictively at an enemy who struck us first, it still seems inconceivable to me that now, having fought it, our basic trend of thought has been so little changed. Without questioning whether that trend is right or wrong, to my war-adjusted mind it is shocking to find it so unaltered.

I am told that I am to exchange my fear of being shot down for a fear of unemployment, a fear of starvation during another depression, a fear of "socialism." But when I ask myself, I know I am not so afraid of these things as I have been of others during the war. Maybe it is because they do not threaten sudden violent death, but only a slow lingering one, or even a mere life of anxiety. Well, these things don't scare me now, though maybe they will when I have time to forget things which scared me more.

My feeling is one of amazement rather than fright. I thought: Now the war is over, we can go on in this ever changing world to something new. But my friends tell me we must go back to the days before the war. There are so many who say it I wonder if they are not right. It may be, as they say, that we shall have to "pay for all this." It may be that people, by earning a good wage, have developed a false idea of money, instead of having got rid of one, as I had supposed. Maybe we need more saving by individuals so that we may all become as thrifty as Chinese peasants.

My mistake was that I thought that part of the pattern was already done, and that now we were going on to a different variation. I felt the peoples of the world were closer together in heart and action now than they had ever been, and that we were ready to progress and discover new things, like a broad-fronted tide all points of which were more nearly abreast of all other points than ever before. If we want to fight Russia, then why did we ever fight Germany? I feel like telephoning someone in charge and protesting that a mistake has been made. Maybe we picked the wrong side, and if so, we certainly lost our chance to administer the *coup de grâce* at about the time of Stalingrad.

I set these thoughts down now because many of my friends have told me that, given a few months, I'll see things just the way they do. If I see them differently now, just give me time. If that's right, then we might as well not close down that place in Tennessee where they make those bombs, because the sooner we strike the better.

PHILIP ARDERY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Back to Normalcy?

THE BIGGEST NEWS STORY here right now is not an event at all—it's a trend. It's a trend away from international to domestic interests, from wars abroad to strikes at home, from daily communiqués to the old auto in the garage. This negative isolationism was bound to come; the great question is how far will it go. That the development is rising full tide, nobody who watches Washington today can doubt. All those grand crusades we started with Pearl Harbor are being put aside to watch the stock market. And so the United States teeters uncertainly in and out of internationalism and the world looks on breathlessly, for, after all, we are the richest and (momentarily) most powerful nation on earth.

Like it or not, Congress seems bent on slashing the Army and Navy, speeding demobilization and withdrawing occupation forces—and Congress believes the public wants it that way. This trend is still balanced by the desire to punish guilty Nazis and Japs, but, if I am any judge, the supporters of withdrawal are gaining strength. America is thinking less about her military influence in Europe and Asia and more about strikes at home. You can't quite put your finger on it. It comes out most in casual chats with congressmen; in the temper of the Byrd "economy" committee when it chastises ex-Governor Lehman for wanting to feed starving Europeans and Filipinos. You get it, too, in the White House. I am told President Truman was pretty defeatist last week when he talked with the delegation led by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, president of Food for Freedom, urging quick additional aid for liberated countries. More than ever, Mr. Truman takes the stand that if Congress won't act, there's little he can do about the situation.

Much of this trend toward let-down and relaxation is inevitable. The impasse of the foreign ministers at London isn't helping much. Some isolationist elements are busy, too, cheering MacArthur against the State Department for urging quick withdrawal of troops, building up the Pearl Harbor investigation to show that the whole war was unnecessary and Roosevelt dragged us into it; urging the last drop of Lend-Lease repayment from Britain and other allies. But a much more potent factor than this is the negative isolationism of popular indifference.

As against this, on the encouraging side, the negotiators on the British debt settlement seem fairly optimistic. Also, to a greater degree than ever, the economic self-interest of important American pressure groups is involved in expanding world trade. The argument for full world trade is a good deal like that for full employment: there are riches for everybody if only the wheels start turning. Farmers, for instance, are vitally concerned in exporting crops to hungry Europe. Paul Ward, hard-working correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun*, reports that Edward A. O'Neal, kingpin of the farm bloc, and Charles W. Holman, leader of the powerful dairy group, are already swinging their cohorts into action in support of generous credit terms for Britain. It is symbolic of the new global trend. It may do more than Wilsonian idealism to overcome isolation. When ex-Governor Lehman talks about starving Greek babies to Congress, he's just being sentimental; but when hard-boiled lobbyists like Holman and O'Neal mention foreign markets for farmers in the same connection, *that's* another matter.

The danger of inflation is probably greater now than at any other time since the war started. It wasn't till the war was over, in 1918, that real inflation took hold, and that may happen again now. In public addresses OPA Administrator Chester Bowles says he is "deeply disturbed" by the situation. Privately, his phrase is that it "scares the daylights out of me." Two factors are more favorable now than at the close of World War I: productivity is greater and the raw-material situation is better. But two other factors are much less favorable for easy settlement: today there is a vastly larger reservoir of spending power, and this time labor and farmers are really organized and won't see their returns cut without a fight. Most dangerous factor of all is that the public's guard is down; controls are being thrown overboard. The building situation is particularly explosive. If rent controls were taken off tomorrow in Detroit there would be a minor revolution. As for building materials, they are so scarce that a load of bricks was hijacked the other day out West. Inflationary prospects are making the stock market advance—particularly the happy thought that the way to balance the budget is to cut taxes, especially excess-profits taxes of big corporations.

Notes. – Most of the talk about whether or not to give the atomic-bomb secret to Russia is wasted breath; scientists here say it isn't really a "secret" at all: Russia can probably duplicate the industrial process in two or three years. . . . Senators McMahon, Hayden, Thomas and Tunnell have introduced a labor bill designed to counteract the restrictive Hatch-Burton-Ball bill; it emphasizes mediation and conciliation, a stronger Labor Department with higher salaries, and an up-to-date Board of Arbitration. . . . New Supreme Court Justice Harold H. Burton believes in compulsory labor arbitration, at least to the degree proposed in the Hatch-Burton-Ball bill. . . . It was high time the Court had a Republican appointee and Burton's removal from the Senate makes way for his interim replacement in that body by a Democrat, which pleases Chairman Hannegan. . . . Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not among the list of Japanese warned cities; the Air Forces say they were being "saved" for atomic bombing. . . . A million and a half soldiers have married since the war started. They all want homes, which increases the housing shortage. . . . Truman's reconversion score to date: he urgently sought federal retention of the employment services; Congress returned them to the states. He sought a $25 weekly maximum for state unemployment compensation; the Senate rejected this, and the House is now expected to throw out certain other concessions made by the Senate. As to the full-employment bill, chances of passage look good. . . . The Senate unanimously approved the confirmation of bitter, anti-New Deal ex-Senator Bennett C. Clark for a federal judgeship last week; shelved nomination of New Dealer Raymond

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

S. McKeough, ex-Representative from Illinois, named to the Maritime Commission, whose record is as good as Clark's is bad.

Washington T. R. B.

A Communication

Texas Is a State of Mind

SIR: When I read the article, "What's the Matter with Texas?" by Clarence E. Ayres in your issue of September 3, my first impression was that I had found another Yankee turned professional Texan. Upon investigation I find that Dr. Ayres (A.B., Brown, 1912; M.A., *Ibid.*, 1914; Harvard, 1913; Ph.D., Chicago, 1917) was born in Lowell, Massachusetts, on May 6 ,1891. All this proves nothing except that the soul of Texas he does not know.

An unduly large amount of space is devoted to a recapitulation of Texanisms which every Texan, but no one else, believes with a fanatical fervency of zeal that is approached only by the alleged devotion of the Japanese to their Emperor. This feeling is so intense that it almost enters the blood stream of Texas children *via* the germ plasm. It is inculcated into their minds both before and as long as they can remember anything. No part of the Texas environment fails to display it. Hitler's Nazi propaganda was weak compared with that which Texas has carried on for its citizens for 100 years. I was 30 years old before I learned that filling stations, banks and offices of insurance agents did not have separate maps of Texas hanging on their walls; and I thought that all children studied Texas history as I did. I still think more children would have liked history if this had been true.

It is virtually impossible to write about Texas without becoming entangled in its myths. This, which Dr. Ayres should know but evidently does not, is a symptom of the basic trouble in Texas. Texas is not worried or disturbed about being a part of the world order. It is a world in itself. For a Texan to think, much less to admit, that he has anything to do with the world except to sell it cotton, oil, sulphur, beef, mohair and a few other things would be the rankest treason. Oh, yes, Texas sends its ambassadors and consuls to Washington, but more or less for the purpose of carrying on the Texas show there. Yet whatever may be done in Texas is right because Texans do it.

Does anyone think Texans could be intimidated when they want to fire the president of the university and a few half-starved, weather-beaten economists, because their neighbors would know about it? Not I. The neighbors can go to hell for all Texas cares.

There is another basic thing wrong with Texas. It was populated by semi-starved, half-literate, malarial, hookworm-infested human kind from the old South; by genteel cavaliers from New England, and by land and cattle thieves from any place. Then, Negroes and Mexicans came to do the work that white men despise, which includes many kinds of work, but mainly work. These racial elements have little to share in common but hatred for each other and loyalty to Texas.

Texas, with more than three times the population of Oklahoma, its nearest neighbor and its only foreign dependency, must have a torrid political campaign to poll more than one and one-half times as many votes as Oklahoma. Texas people are disfranchised as a result of the malevolent tyrannies which have prevailed there since the Revolution in 1836. Because of its population structure, there is no such thing as freedom in Texas, nor does anyone obey the law.

Those rare Texans who want to preserve the integrity of the university cannot do it because neither the legal machinery nor public opinion supports them. Texas likes big things, and pays dearly and recklessly for them. Austin has a big Capitol building, and the university has a big campus with all kinds of enormous buildings which honor the Texas tradition. What more is wanted? The constitution which provides for the establishment of the university forgot to inaugurate safeguards to ensure that it would serve its intended function.

The bigness of Texas is not the least of its drawbacks. Every schoolboy is alarmed to find that Russia, Brazil, Canada, China and India are all bigger than Texas, and the knowledge that Alaska is twice as big and is still a part of the United States hits him with the force of an atomic bomb. This sense of bigness distorts all other values and ideas of relationships which Texans may have. Texans spend hours studying the map to see how much of the United States would be blotted out if Texas were to flop itself over in various directions. This applies not only to space, but also to personal merit, honor and other qualities. Actually, a true-blooded Texan has a mingled feeling of pity, contempt and indifference toward anyone born elsewhere. For this reason, Texas does not care a rag how it stacks up against the rest of the world on such things as illiteracy, homicides, poverty, divorce and the like. While Texans brag that Texas leads in more things than any other state, there is much doubt, if the statement is true at all, that it could make this claim if it were merely twice as big as each of the other states. Not even with its size does it lead in population, manufacturing, wealth, health, cultural advancement, miles of navigable streams or of coast line, broom corn, potatoes, etc., etc.

I do not believe that Dr. Ayres can palm off upon the world any story that Texas is always playing the clown because it is a part of what is going on in the world, and make it stick. Like any Yankee in Texas, he is forced either to turn out a magnificent apology for the state and its political hoodlums or say nothing. One objective chirp out of him would jeopardize his earthly existence. The Civil War has not ended there yet. If his main thesis were correct, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Ohio, California and other states would be applying the blood purge to their universities. Texas has never taken the lead in any positive political or social program of betterment, except in its fight with Mexico. It has always been the last to number its automobiles, mark its highways, register its births and deaths, protect its children in industry, enfranchise its citizens, and to wipe its own political nose. I see no logical reason why it should become the center of gravity in a new cosmic upheaval when it has never before had any more concern about such things than has a monkey for the evolution of the Baptist religion.

Stillwater, Okla. OTIS DURANT DUNCAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Himmler hanged hundreds of active conspirators between January and October, 1944. With few exceptions they were not left-wing radicals, but civilized persons interested in the restoration of order and law . . . – *Dorothy Thompson in her syndicated column.*

It [the Knights of Pythias] selects its membership without prejudice or preferment; distinctions of race and religion, occupation and profession are forgotten. – *From a "Symposium on the Order of Knights of Pythias."*

I declare upon my honor that I am a white male . . . – *From Knights of Pythias Application for Membership blank.*

It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features. Those who learn to "ride the business cycle" can find as many advantages in depressions as in booms—personal, as well as business advantages. Smart folks take advantage of the boom. They save what they can and keep their savings liquid. They are then ready for depression-time bargains, bargains in every conceivable thing from a suit of clothes to a railroad. Many even welcome unemployment as a chance to relax and to use spare time in various profitable ways. . . . That name "depression" is inappropriate. It horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits. Let us keep those periods but abolish the name. Let us use some other name. "Business Recess" suggests an interval of leisure for rest and perhaps play, which such a period always brings. – *From an article by Ralph B. Blodgett in* Opinion and Comment, *University of Illinois Bulletin.*

Democracy in Action: Texas Division

Prompted by the shortage of cotton-pickers, city and county law-enforcement officers got together Monday in an effort to round up Negroes who refuse to go to the fields and who have no other work, so far as can be discovered.

About 16 were placed in jail and the campaign will be continued in an effort to move these potential cotton-pickers off the streets and to the cotton fields. – *From the Bryan (Texas)* Daily Eagle.

County Fair

President Truman is expected to give the political wheel of fortune a spin tomorrow, and when it stops—at a place already known to the President . . . – *Bert Andrews in the New York* Herald Tribune.

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of the New Republic. *Please enclose the original clipping.* – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

"Church, State and Schools"

SIR: The article, "Church, State and Schools," by Lucille B. Milner [the *New Republic*, August 13] brings to focus not only the problem of church and religion but also the problem of education and personal and social reconstruction. As the implications (both good and evil) of the atomic bomb become more apparent, these two problems will loom *pari passu* larger and more important.

For the church in all its symbols and practices (which the author identifies with religion) arrogates to itself the salvation of society, while institutions of education, to the extent that they fight the inclusion of doctrinal teaching, do the same—at least they believe implicitly that their plan of salvation is better than the church's.

Thus, for example, Mrs. Milner's opposition to the encroachment of church upon school seems to rest on nothing more explicit than democratic (*i.e.*, American) tradition or "historic principle"—which loses meaning when she says that "liberal" people support the Mead-Aiken bill. Nevertheless I am in accord with her basic thesis of separation of Church and State, though on anthropological and axiological grounds. It seems to me that unless "liberals" can discover an objective basis for their ideas regarding the salvation of society, they simply become another blind sect in the tempest of messiahs. For do we fight fascism merely because it happens to threaten our security—or because our faith is rooted in the nature of man and the world as objectively determined and hence determinative of our course?

The separation of Church and State (and therefore education) which came with the Protestant Reformation and the rise of science has been both a boon and a bane: science has prospered and life has been enriched, but the training of the young, especially at the formative levels of high school and college, has on the whole been drained of a social dynamic and directive which the medieval church formerly provided. Today's dilemma of Church and State is conditioned by this Renaissance contrast between reason and faith.

I submit that a democratic faith can be reasonable—*i.e.*, rationally and empirically determined. Some men at the University of Chicago have already laid the foundations for such a faith: Hartshorne, Wieman (Divinity School), Gerard, Emerson (biological sciences), Morris (philosophy) and Allee (see his article, "Biology and International Relations," *New Republic*, June 11, 1945). These, to be sure, are only beginnings in the science of value and the establishment of a scientifically founded faith.

I mention these because such a foundation is necessary to, though not sufficient for, an actual commitment in society to the value or values confirmed by inquiry to be the best. Active commitment to something may be better or worse; and until the criterion of better and worse is established, there can be little more than a war of each against all, one regime as blind and evil as its predecessor, with only a fortuitous realization of social good. The problem of better and worse becomes exigent as the range of man's choice to do good or evil magnifies immensely with the release of atomic power.

So the issue is not the Lord's Prayer, the Scriptures, ecclesiastical garb, the crucifix, theology, etc., v. traditional separation of Church and State. It becomes ultimately one dogmatism (faith) v. another dogmatism. The question then is, which faith is the better? That question cannot be answered apart from some theory of value, and honest "liberals" will not disparage Catholicism or fascism unless they can propose such a criterion and directive as well as a plan of practical implementation—unless they can show people they would not substitute merely another tyranny for the one in power or struggling to be there.

I would ask (in passing) if the Christian Bible could not be studied with the same devotion to scientific standards used in study of the Marxist bible, and the democratic canon, and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

biological scriptures. And further, why should not teachers be required to meet perpetually with their colleagues to discuss the nature and purpose of education and society? That might be one way of combating the evil in the world, not a little of which lies in us, the liberals.

HOWARD L. PARSONS
Federated Theological Schools, the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

SIR: My plea to liberals and others to halt the churches' encroachment upon our public schools, and to oppose the enactment of the Mead-Aiken bill which would bolster those encroachments through the machinery of the law was not made, as Professor Parsons implied, merely because I want to perpetuate the status quo. I would hold fast to the principle of separation of Church and State not because it is a "historic" principle but because it is the keystone to our democratic way of life. The churches must not be permitted to enter politics in this country; it is obvious that dipping into the school tax funds for parochial-school purposes means just that. History and contemporary experience have taught us that our principles of civil and religious liberty cannot exist under a union of Church and State, and I firmly believe that if the present efforts succeed in effecting such an alliance our democracy will perish.

Professor Parsons believes with countless others that the world is in need of a revival of religion. As this was not discussed in my article, "Church, State and Schools," I do not care to go into the merits of that contention here. However, I would point out that in this country the individual has the full right to hold any religious beliefs and the churches the right to teach any religious doctrines and to practise any religious principles which do not violate the laws or infringe upon the rights of others. All denominations are on an equal footing. Let them remain so forever, and let the churches develop through their Sunday schools and the family that religious faith which Professor Parsons believes essential to the salvation of society.

New York City LUCILLE B. MILNER

Alger's Vitality

SIR: Although Malcolm Cowley confesses in your issue of September 10 that he never read Horatio Alger as a boy, his review of some recent reprints of Alger stories is rich with understanding of what such books meant to American boyhood, my own included, a good many years ago. I reveled in them, I wallowed in them. Merely repeating some of the titles evokes in the years of my senility a mood of literary joy in my youth never quite matched by any printed page in all the days to follow. For many years I have been reluctant to reread those yarns, fearful of tarnishing boyhood memories of the delight they brought me. Now that Mr. Cowley has proved that an adult can read an Alger book without snickering constantly, I shall hazard a return to the scenes and personages of my childhood.

Those scenes were stereotypes, the characters cut-outs, the plots assembly-line products long before assembly lines were thought of in American industry. I suppose a book could be written proving that the proper way not to write books was the way chosen by Horatio Alger Jr. The confounding fact remains: a devitalized *papier-maché* product filled with moral chromos contained, nevertheless, that secret ingredient of all writing which endures—vitality. The sophisticated cerebrum may be appalled by the monstrous absurdity of a father whose son has fallen overboard putting a specific dollar value on the life of his progeny and in anguish bidding up the reward: "A thousand—ten thousand dollars to anyone who will save him!" But the viscera perhaps knows better than the cerebrum. It knows that ten thousand dollars betoken an intensity of emotion which is unanswerable. Such dialogue was never used in real life by any father; this is as certain as that lovers never conversed as they do in *Romeo and Juliet*. The point is, Romeo and Juliet as symbolic characters could not have talked differently without removing from the play the "vitality of finality." And, on as low a level as you please, Alger characters had a comparable air of finality just because it is impossible for us to imagine issuing from their mouths any language substantially different from the stilted nonsense they speak.

C. E. M. Joad once defined a masterpiece as a work we do not want to alter, even with reference to its shortcomings. I think there may be something in that theory, something applicable even to such books as Alger's. In any event, literary critics might muse on it. It is up to them to concoct some plausible explanation for the remarkable impact which Alger's work made upon millions of readers. It is equally incumbent upon those theorists to account for a still greater absurdity—that a string of boys' books wholly devoid of literary merit should have outlasted most books of their own day and, in fact, outlasted most books printed five or ten years ago.

Vitality? Finality? Inevitability? It may seem absurd to apply such words to scenes and characters such as Alger's. If so, Mr. Cowley may suggest some substitutes. But they will have to be good. They will have to be very good. Otherwise the *New Republic* will be placed in the position of giving three solid columns to a review of some recent reprints of nonsensical juveniles. I do not believe such a thing happened; and it is obvious that Mr. Cowley, with the intuitions of maturity, doesn't believe so either. Though he missed them as a boy, he seems to have a sneaking suspicion that Alger's books on their own level are classics. And I have a sneaking suspicion that he is damned right.

New York City WINTHROP PARKHURST

Spence of Kentucky

SIR: In Helen Fuller's article entitled "Truman Faces Congress" [the *New Republic*, September 10], we read about Congressman "Spence of North Carolina." Representative Brent Spence hails from Kentucky's Fifth Congressional District, across the river from Cincinnati. Just thought you'd like to know.

Columbus, O. HENRY STONER

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Julius Butwin of Minneapolis says that Professor Brogan ("Britain's New Foreign Policy," the *New Republic*, August 20) "hopes for a split in the European labor movement" and wants "a Left which will exclude the Communists."

Paul R. Davis of Philadelphia writes to point out the continuance of anti-Semitism in former Axis nations, Axis satellites and occupied countries. He says it is up to the United States and Great Britain "to help those governments in re-educating their people to democracy," especially since the United States, through UNRRA, will have the burden of feeding Europe.

W. S. of St. Louis asks if the reason for Senator Byrd's "unholy haste" for the 40-hour week for federal employees is "that they should spend the double-weekend holidays on the street corner selling apples," and points out that raises for federal employees were long overdue, taxes and other deductions heavy, and cutbacks would mean severe underpayment.

A new magazine, the *Hollywood Quarterly*, plans its first issue for October. It will deal with radio and motion pictures from an educational and professional point of view. Addressed to writers, technologists, educators, sociologists and others concerned with the techniques and responsibilities of mass communication, the *Quarterly* is sponsored jointly by the University of California and the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization. Offices are at 350 Royce Hall, University of California in Los Angeles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Existentialism: A Preface

THERE IS much talk in Paris, in Greenwich Village, even in the center of Manhattan, about existence and existentialism. The existentialists assemble in the Café de Flore in Paris. There is a series of books being published on existence by the Librairie Gallimard; a Communist, in an article published in *Action* in Paris, writes against existential philosophy; *Horizon* in London has published an article on existentialist drama in France. Already an article by Auden[1] has familiarized the American public with one aspect and with the source of the idea of existence, Kierkegaard.

One day a man, Kierkegaard, was deeply dissatisfied with the ideas of Hegel. Hegel had shown that the truth is the whole, be it in art, in society, in history, and that beyond the particular wholes, there is the absolute whole which contains everything. But Kierkegaard said: "I am no part of a whole, I am not integrated, not included. To put me in this whole you imagine is to negate me. Who am I? I am an intensity of feeling in relation with beings, and particularly with the Divine Being, who excites my desire, my knowledge. I want to be in a kind of self-destroying contact with God, the Absolute Other." Another idea of Kierkegaard was that the rationalistic scheme of Hegel destroyed possibility, and our actions are only understandable in a world where possibility exists. Individuality as separated from society, from reason, from ethics, and possibility as distinct from reality, were vindicated by Kierkegaard.

So once again "To be or not to be": that was the question. Let us remark in passing that there were very great men who were existentialists, or rather, let us say with Kierkegaard, existent men without knowing it. We have suggested that Hamlet was an existent. Pascal also. And the nearly unknown French philosopher, Lequier. Perhaps Carlyle too (but let us put Carlyle into the background; people do not like Carlyle very much nowadays; I like him), Melville also. Even Socrates, says Kierkegaard, was an existent man. And we may add the great foe of Socrates, Nietzsche. Let us stop here. For we could show that the bases of the great philosophies, as those of Plato, Descartes, Kant, may be found in existential revelations.

Then comes the second act: for Kierkegaard, existence and God, the transcendent, the Absolute Other, were linked. We see in the philosophy of the German philosopher Jaspers more intellectualized and generalized echoes of the same tendencies which were in Kierkegaard. It is no longer a question of relation to God and to Jesus Christ, but to an obscure background of which we have the feeling, but which we can never catch, except in partial and fugitive moments, so that finally we succumb and are in a certain manner the victims of a kind of shipwreck. But our situation is such that we have to accomplish this pursuit and to assert ourselves in this very shipwreck.

Another German philosopher, Heidegger, cancels God and is sorry for it. But to be sorry is a very existential feeling. We are left alone, derelict, relinquished, not by God who does not exist, but derelict, dropped *in se* (one could question this). Nevertheless we accomplish a movement of transcendence, not toward God, Who does not exist, but toward the world and toward the future. We cannot speculate on ourselves as being outside the world. If we transcend, we transcend in the world.

We are in the world. This seems quite common sense. But in fact few philosophers had insisted on it. Descartes had discarded at first the reality of the world. Kant had questioned its very idea. Our essence, according to Heidegger, cannot be separated from the world; we are open to the world. Leibnitz had said that monads have no windows. But for Heidegger individuals have no windows because they are always essentially outdoors.

For Heidegger, man is essentially the being who puts into question his own existence. In this sense he is the being who philosophizes because of his very being. And this calling existence into question, which is at the same time what Heidegger names the comprehension of existence, is risking and endangering one's own being.

This idea of the individual being at stake allows us to go to the second transcendence implied in Heidegger's philosophy, the transcendence toward the future. We find here again the insistence which we had seen in Kierkegaard on possibility. Man is the being always directing himself toward his own possibilities. He is always in advance of himself, ahead of himself. So we might say in this sense that the time of existence begins with the future. Existence is what has to exist. We might even say that the totality of the world is implied in [illegible]ue philosophical question at the same time that in the [illegible]estions the destiny of the individual is at stake. But these possibilities are not abstract ones; they are embedded in particular conditions which have not been chosen by the individual. In such a manner the individual is as well related to the past as to the future. And it is this double relation with the past and with the future which constitutes the present. We see how time defines existence and existence time. And man cannot be completely separated from his fellow men; in our knowledge itself, the presence of other human beings is implied.

But we do not always realize this real existence, and we remain in a superficial way of life imposed on us by our laziness and by social conventions. Man is at first on the superficial level and in order to go to the deeper level he has to pass through some experiences, and Kierkegaard has already insisted on the importance of anxiety as revealing the temptations of possibilities. Heidegger gives a more metaphysical and ontological status to this experience of anguish. The nothingness which is experienced in anguish is not the partial nothingness of possibility, but the utter nothingness of Not Being. According to Heidegger, Not Being is active. But he cannot express this activity except in terms which are themselves negative, and it is for this reason (this passage

[1] "A Preface to Kierkegaard," the *New Republic*, May 15, 1944.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has caused much scandal among logical positivists and many others) that he says that nothingness, or Not Being, "nothings itself" because he cannot say it is; so he says it does something like "nothinging" itself and every other thing. It is the negative background of Being.

The followers of Heidegger, in particular Levinas and Sartre, have emphasized nausea as revealing this background of Being. But the existent does not have to remain a passive prey to the phenomena of anxiety and nausea. He may triumph over them. He may take upon himself his fate. That is what Heidegger calls the resolute decision. (Kierkegaard called this repetition. Notice how often we find the thought of Kierkegaard behind the thought of Heidegger.)

It is Kierkegaard who has given to the term existence the meaning it has kept in the so-called philosophies of existence which followed. Heidegger, who is so often represented as one of the philosophers of existence, thinks he is not one of them, and prefers to leave the title to his former friend Jaspers. He himself says he is interested essentially in being, and existence is for him only a particular structure of being. There are two other structures: the structure of things which are seen by our eyes, and the structure of things which are used as our instruments. Existence is the structure of the seer and the user. Man alone exists. (I do not know where he places animals.) Notwithstanding Heidegger's desire not to be essentially a philosopher of existence, the fact remains that in the first part of his great work, the one part we have, he defines particularly the structure of existences. As we have seen, existence is for him care-ridden, intent on itself, making projects and always in the world.

There are at least two important ideas in Heidegger: the idea of existence which he takes from Kierkegaard and the idea of being-in-the-world, which he takes from Husserl, the great philosopher and his master, whom Heidegger, in the early days of Nazism, prevented from entering the university buildings of Freiburg, because Husserl was a Jew. It is the fusion of these two ideas which gives to the philosophy of Heidegger his particular coloring: existence being full of care because it is in the world and the being-in-the-world taking the form of dereliction, because Heidegger insists particularly on the isolation of existence and also because he looks on the world from what we might call a formerly religious point of view.

The consequence of these two ideas is that we have to destroy nearly all the common-sense philosophical ideas—I mean particularly essence and substance. My essence is not separated from my existence. Plato was wrong. (And Heidegger knows Plato admirably.) Philosophy will no more be essence-philosophy but existence-philosophy.

We spoke of a "formerly religious point of view." This may lead us to see one failure of the philosophy of Heidegger. It implies a view of the world which has been destroyed by himself. If he were completely freed from his religious suppositions, Heidegger would not be Heidegger, and he has logically to be freed of them. So if we push Heidegger's philosophy in the logical direction, we have to do away with some of the most essential feelings which characterize his work. In this sense Nietzsche was certainly a bolder thinker. Midway between Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, Heidegger is in the world of Nietzsche with the feelings of Kierkegaard, and in the world of Kierkegaard with the feelings of Nietzsche.

We have seen the present characteristics of existentialism. It seems to be linked with feelings of separateness, of dereliction and deep melancholy. Might it not be otherwise? In fact, Jaspers and some French existentialists like Gabriel Marcel insist more on community. Are feelings like ennui or nausea or anxiety so particularly revelatory of the world and why are they entitled to such a privilege? We might also wonder whether the thought of death has such a prevailing importance as Heidegger gives to it, and whether hope as well as the thought of our essential finitude has not to be taken into account. Moreover, some notions seem to have been insufficiently analyzed, like the one of possibility which has such importance as well in Jaspers as in Kierkegaard and Heidegger. (But Sartre says very precise things on it.)

As for the notion of being, we may even question whether the opposition which is drawn by Heidegger between what he calls ontical and what he calls ontological is not, at least in some of his disciples, a kind of artificial manner of distinguishing Heidegger's philosophy from the other ones. For there are a certain number of tricks which are used with great skill by the disciples of Heidegger. And there is a kind of scholastic aspect to existentialism.

Another weak point in this philosophy is the moral conclusion of Heidegger, this resolute decision which sometimes looks like a conventional ending of an unconventional philosophy. There is a kind of discernment to be made between the different elements of this doctrine. And if the metaphysical ideas seem valid, there may be some doubt about the validity of the ethical conclusion; the more so since the actions, the very existence, of this existential philosopher have not always given the idea of what we would call the real resolute decision. And he fell prey, during some years at least, to Nazism and transferred quite illegitimately to a people, the German people, what he had said about the individual, renewing, with much less logic, the mistake of Hegel. This is not sufficient to condemn his metaphysical assertions, but may lead us to question his judgment and his worth as a moral guide.

We mentioned some great existent men before existentialism. There is here a disturbing question. Is there not some danger that the knowledge of existentialism may kill the very thought of existence it wants to preserve? Here we find the existentialist's dilemma.

Sometimes I think, sometimes I am, says intellectualist Valéry, and he chooses thinking; others prefer to choose being. But Valéry *is*, in a very subtle manner sometimes. And Heidegger thinks, also in a highly sophisticated manner.

Then comes the third act. Some young French philosophers, some of the best of them, find in these ideas something new and unaccustomed, and something which is an answer to their own anxiety. There was already in France something which might have been compared with existentialism. But it was in the last years before the war that the influence of Heidegger made itself felt. Let us also acknowledge that one cannot read Heidegger without a kind of drunkenness, that particular drunkenness which German philosophical wines of the best vintage give. Notwithstanding the unreliability of the French translations of Heidegger, there was a real interest in his doctrines which persisted in philosophical and literary circles. It is perhaps too soon to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speak of the work of Sartre, of Camus, who has united his belief in the Absurd with a faith in action, of Bataille, who is inspired by his own experience and who, claiming Nietzsche as his master, tries to formulate what he calls an ethics of the summits.

Let us merely give some rules for the distinction between what is existentialism and what is not. If you say—man is in his own world, a world limited by death and experienced in anxiety; he has a comprehension of himself as essentially careful, bent on finitude in the horizon of temporality with its three ecstasies of future, past, present—you have Heideggerian existentialism.

If you say—man is for himself, and this inadequacy produces in him a kind of disgust before the too numerous things in themselves, and a kind of fright before the thing for itself which he is and is not—you will have the Sartrean brand of Heideggerianism, tinged, as you may see, with Hegelianism.

If you say—I am a thinking substance, as Descartes said, or the real beings are ideas, as Plato, or the I accompanies our representations, as Kant said—you are no existentialist.

Now we must at the same time pay attention to the fact that the philosophy of Heidegger is important and has to be studied, but also to the fact that one has to sift very carefully the different, rather heterogeneous elements, which compose this philosophy.

It is always a good thing when minds are excited about high questions. Existentialism teaches us once more what every great philosophy has taught us: that there are views of reality which are not completely reducible to scientific explanations. Naturally, those who are of the contrary opinion will try to explain existentialism scientifically, by economic or historical reasons. But the essence of existentialism is to deny, not the rightfulness of such explanations from their own point of view, but their all-sufficiency.

We become conscious, through Heidegger, of a whole movement, starting from Kierkegaard, with his emphasis on existence, on the one hand, from Husserl on the other, with his indirect insistence on being-in-the-world, meeting sometimes Bergson and Whitehead (who in his own genuine way emphasizes being-in-the-world). We are at the beginning, we are in the beginning, of a new philosophy.

JEAN WAHL

A Noble Experiment

The Facts of Life, by Paul Goodman. New York: The Vanguard Press. 261 pages. $2.50.

NOTHING is drearier, as reviewers of the New Directions anthologies have been saying for years, than the mass of what continues in this country to be described (and published) as experimental writing. Some of it, the more talented, has an orphic charm and recalls pleasantly the literary excitements of the past century or so. But most of it is as ritualistic and unthoughtful as the philistine objections to it.

Unfortunately the philistines are often right when they want desperately to believe that esoteric productions so disturbing in their manifest content really have no latent content at all. I mean all those poems without subject or sequence, but with a sharp sense of currency in metaphor and syntax. Or those prose fantasies which rearrange the symbols, the "found objects," of earlier writers, objects which were originally found because their discoverers were actually seeking something. Or those textbook dreams detached from any detailed life-history which they might illumine. Or those Kafka-like fables written by men whose anxieties drive them rather to be up-to-date than to seek God. Such literature lives on in its limbo without the corrective of criticism, for what can the mind do with it? In what terms of better or worse can the representatives of these genres be compared?

This situation is interesting because it is not at all what might be expected at the present time if one took the word "experimental" literally as meaning a testing of ideas by projecting them, dramatizing them, personalizing them, by letting them operate freely or under control, or by seeking their counterparts in our inner, existential life. What with our complex social situation, our catholic appreciation of past cultures, and the recent advances in psychology and anthropology, in the studies of language and logic, we are overwhelmed with ideas that need testing and ordering, not simply intellectually, but on those profounder levels where only the imaginative artist can speak with authority. Amid such wealth one might suppose that the non-commercial magazines would be full of projects, of experiments which, if not always high art, would still be intellectually exciting, and morally and emotionally instructive.

Unhappily this is not the case, and it is just because Paul Goodman is one of the distinguished few who think at all in these terms that his work properly attracts attention. The thirteen selections in *The Facts of Life* give a very clear impression of his virtues and limitations, and a less clear indication, though their time and place of composition are always carefully noted, of his direction of growth.

Mr. Goodman has read widely and thought about what he has read. He observes sharply what comes to his attention outside and inside himself. But he wants to get it all into his compositions impatiently by saying it instead of slowly and difficultly by realizing it. His manner and structure are those of the essayist rather than the creator. Although in his excellent essay in *Stoplight* on the idea of the Japanese Noh play, Mr. Goodman dealt appreciatively with the psychic or spiritual purpose of dramatic form, in *The Facts of Life* he seems always to be meddling with or commenting on the form in a way to prevent adequate emotional response. Usually an artist's working thought about his characters and situations is regarded as a scaffolding to be taken down when the building is completed, but in "A Goat for Azazel" Mr. Goodman knocks down the building and leaves the scaffolding, so that the result, as with most of his longer pieces, for all the separately acute ideas, is rather tedious and confusing.

He is at his best in the shorter pieces, like "The Facts of Life" and "The University in Exile" (these two have to do with Jews rather in the manner of Ben Hecht's *A Jew in Love*), where people are allowed to talk and act for themselves, or in those like "Frances," "Orpheus in the Underworld" and "The Canoeist," which reveal serious feelings more nearly appropriate to the seriousness of Mr. Goodman's ideas. For many of his clearly seen human figures are comic and contemptible, and make his work

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more limited experientially than intellectually. He seems, in fact, a little afraid to body forth his greater loves and admirations. His style may suggest the limiting reasons. It ranges between that of Auden's "The Orators" and that of Dreiser's "Dawn." At its best it has a witty and engaging awkwardness. It is seen at its worst in "The Commodity Embodied in Bread," a chirrupy illustrative lesson in transcendental economics which might, except for the style, have been written by Stuart Chase.

ROBERT GORHAM DAVIS

American Science—13,000 B.C.?

Tihuancu: The Cradle of American Man, by Arthur Posnansky. New York: J. J. Augustin, Inc. Two volumes bound in one, illustrated. 406 pages. $30.

ON THE HIGH PLAIN of Bolivia—some 12,000 feet above the Pacific—lie the ruins of what is perhaps the oldest site of civilization in the New World. This is Tiahuanaco (Tihuancu to Posnansky). A few great stones suggest the extent and the majesty of its many structures; the rest made the quarry from which churchmen and *cholos* drew materials for sacred and profane buildings. The stones that remain are still eloquent—particularly a monolithic door of superb proportions on which are stylized carvings of provocative significance.

It is one of the derelictions of archeology that less scientific study has been given to Tihuanaco than to any ruin of equal importance in the Old or the New World. Except for the labors of Bennett of Yale, archeological work has been, in the main, either physically destructive or theoretically extravagant. The Latins have made few blunders, but also no important excavations. The German Kiss, the Englishman Bellamy and the Polish-Bolivian Posnansky have reasoned widely and wildly. No important site of man's creative effort has been the victim of quite such extravagant theory as Tiahuanaco. Following the lead of Kiss and the ideas of a German scientist named Hoeriger, Bellamy put Tiahuanaco's first buildings back to 11,500 B.C., and had the moon—not to mention an earlier satellite of some 250,000 years ago—flood Bolivia's Andean plain with an equatorial "girdle-tide" which laid a belt of ocean water around the earth for millennia on end. Posnansky, in *Tihuancu, The Cradle of American Man*, has brought out a handsome book printed in both Spanish and English, to prove that the stones of this site were first carved 15,000 years ago, when glaciers were fading from European valleys and the paintings of Cro-Magnon man were beginning to appear on the walls of caves.

Posnansky's proof of Tiahuanaco's super-antiquity rests mainly on the fact that the diagonals of an important structure correspond to the solstitial positions of the sun 15,000 years ago when the axis of the earth lay in a different plane. Apart from the fact that the structure was not quite squarely laid out—something which Posnansky attributes to a convenient shift of one side on its clay base—one may suspect that the scientists of 15,000 years ago were none too accurate in their observations. Especially since Posnansky must postulate that their observations were made when a hill which now obscures the horizon did not then exist.

Unfortunately, this fine and devoted book is not free from absurdities. There is certainly nothing at Tiahuanaco to justify the statement that its "sciences, arts, ceramics and sculpture reached such a degree of perfection that these were not surpassed by any American people until the Conquest." In the light of what we know of European prehistory, it is absurd to say that "men possessed a high culture there [at Tihuancu] when in Eurasia they were still ignorant of the use of fire."

Despite all this, Posnansky's volume—which is to be followed shortly by another—has much to commend it. The author has labored over this site for some forty years. From time to time, he has photographed stones that are now destroyed, and with tireless energy he has succeeded in physically preserving much that otherwise would have been lost to us. Because of this, his book is an invaluable treasury of hundreds of half-tone plates and drawings. Though much besides Posnansky's extravagant theories may lead us to doubt that "there are no problems or mysteries in Tihuancu," American students of anthropology should welcome this volume. It suggests, if it does not prove, that there is more in ancient Tiahuanaco than is dreamed of in their present philosophy.

KENNETH MACGOWAN

A Reader's List

POSTWAR MARKETS, edited by E. J. Howenstine (Public Affairs Press, cloth, $2.50; paper, $2). When the CED was first organized, it sponsored a study of markets after the war which was published under the aegis of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. This cautiously optimistic brochure is reprinted here, together with the Bureau's analysis of postwar prospects for 30 major industries. While most of the prognoses appear to be reasonable, the Bureau seems deeply concerned with the creation of a favorable atmosphere for business enterprise. It urges businessmen to engage in market analysis, sales research and to promote new products as a means of achieving maximum production. Only a continuous flow of income generated by productive activity will assure economic well-being, says the Bureau. Yet it has failed to face the dilemma of pyramided income distribution. When 18 percent of the population receives 50 percent of the income, we are indeed presented with a serious problem.

POSTWAR JOBS, edited by Nelson and Henrietta Poynter (Public Affairs Press, $2.50). The material in this postwar economic guide was compiled by Press Research, a publishers' information service. Its title is somewhat misleading: the chapters deal with full employment, reconversion, taxation, surplus-property disposal, social security, public works, housing and foreign trade. They present all the basic data, together with brief statements which indicate the attitudes of government officials. A paragraph called "Where Does Congress Stand?" concludes each section and is a valuable guide to legislative opinion. The chapters on full employment and taxation are especially noteworthy: the latter contains a particularly incisive analysis of the Twin Cities, Ruml and CED tax programs. The viewpoint of the editors is liberal. For one who wants the facts, this book will prove extremely useful.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contributors

EDWIN A. LAHEY, one of the country's leading labor reporters, is on the staff of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago *Daily News*.

K. ZILLIACUS is the recently elected Labor member of Parliament from Gateshead, near Newcastle-on-Tyne. He was educated in Sweden, Finland and England, and was graduated from the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale. He served in the last war as an intelligence officer in the British Military Mission in Siberia, and between wars was a member of the League of Nations Secretariat. During this war he worked in the British Ministry of Information. He is the author of many books and pamphlets.

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE, consulting engineer, served as vice-chairman of the National Power Policy Commission. He is the author, among other books, of *Academic Industrial Efficiency*, *Organized Labor and Production* (with Philip Murray) and *Brazil on the March*.

PHILIP ARDERY, 31, went overseas as a squadron commander in the third Liberator group to reach England. He flew combat missions from the Middle East, North Africa and England as a pilot in Brigadier General E. J. Timberlake's itinerant wing, known as the "Flying Circus." While overseas he was promoted from Captain to Lieutenant Colonel and became operations officer of the Second Combat Bomber Wing. He received the Silver Star for leading a squadron in the Ploesti raid of August 1, 1943, and two DFC's, one for leading a wing on an early Berlin raid. He is now in legal practice with Edwin F. Pritchard Jr., in Lexington and Frankfort, Kentucky.

OTIS DURANT DUNCAN is head of the Department of Sociology and Rural Life at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. He was born in Texas and lived there until he was 29.

JEAN WAHL, professor of Philosophy at the Sorbonne, is the author of books on Plato, Hegel, Kierkegaard and the pluralistic philosophies. He was imprisoned in Paris by the Germans and spent some time in a concentration camp in 1941.

ROBERT GORHAM DAVIS, an associate professor of English at Smith College and a frequent contributor to the critical journals, is writing a book on the psychology of plot.

KENNETH MACGOWAN, whose hobby is archeology, is a well known Hollywood motion-picture producer, associated with Paramount.

☆ ☆ ☆

Your Washington Office

A group of associates with diverse experience, excellent contacts and progressive outlook, offers a variety of public relations services to businesses, trade associations and organizations. Legislative and economic information, newsletters, publications, publicity, special assignments and consulting. We will gladly propose a program suited to your needs and budget.

BOX P THE NEW REPUBLIC 1416 F ST. NW WASHINGTON 4

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933, of The New Republic, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for October 1st, 1945.

STATE OF NEW YORK } SS.
COUNTY OF NEW YORK }

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and County, aforesaid, personally appeared Daniel Mebane, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of The New Republic and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption required by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business manager are:

Publisher, Editorial Publications, Inc.,	40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.
Editor, Bruce Bliven,	40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.
Managing Editor, Bruce Bliven,	40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.
Business Manager, Daniel Mebane,	40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

2. That the owners are:

Editorial Publications, Inc.,	40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

Stockholders owning 1 percent or more of total amount of stock:

Westrim, Ltd.,	P. O. Box 2580, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
* Straight Holding Co., Ltd.,	c/o The Royal Trust Co., Charlottetown, P. E. I., Canada

* All outstanding shares of Straight Holding Co., Ltd., are divided between two trusts, created by Dorothy Whitney Elmhirst, of which the Royal Trust Company, Montreal, Canada, is Trustee.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities, are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person/or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by him.

DANIEL MEBANE.
Signature of Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 18th day of September, 1945.
MARIAN T. KEENAN, Notary Public.
My commission expires March 30, 1947.

THE JOHN L. ELLIOTT INSTITUTE
SOCIETY FOR ETHICAL CULTURE
2 W. 64th St., N. Y. 23 SU. 7-5200

Offers Six Timely Lecture Courses

J. RAYMOND WALSH, *From War to Work*, 8 Wed. evenings begin. Oct. 3; **LAWRENCE K. ROSINGER,** *America's Stake in Asia*, 8 Fri. evenings begin. Oct. 5; **STERLING P. LAMPRECHT,** *Our Heritage and Our Future*, 8 Thur. evenings begin. Oct. 4; **DAVID S. MUZZEY,** *Crises in American Foreign Policy*, 8 Tues. evenings begin. Oct. 2; **HENRY NEUMANN,** *Evenings with World Literature*, 6 Wed. evenings begin. Oct. 3; **JEROME NATHANSON,** *Figures of Protest*, 8 Fri. evenings begin. Oct. 5.

Fees: 6-lecture course $3; 8-lecture course $4; single lecture $1. Send for descriptive folder R today. Registration now.

FOR SALE

CIGARETTES — All popular brands. Extremely fast service. $1.39 a carton postpaid; minimum order, 3 cartons. Send check or money order today. **Ace Mail Order B, Box 150, East Orange N. J.**

EDUCATION

The principles of coordination set forth by F. MATTHIAS ALEXANDER in The Use of the Self are now being taught by Frank Pierce Jones, Ph.D., at 180 Marlborough Street, Boston, Mass.

LANGUAGES

29 LANGUAGES by Linguaphone, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese—Direct conversational method of mastering any language quickly, easily, correctly at home. Send for FREE book. LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE, 86 RCA Bldg., New York. CI 7-0830.

SITUATION WANTED

TEACHER, LECTURER, 3 Degrees, Math. Physics, Elec. Radio. Also willing to invest small capital in private school or other educational project. Address: Box 651, The New Republic.

WANTED

MEMBERS to join a cooperative bungalow colony in the mountains for summer vacation. Address: Box 652, The New Republic.

Order your books — all books — mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

***from* NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS**

40 E. 49th St., New York 17, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED